



CITY OF VANCOUVER
Community Services Group
Current Planning

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

Minutes of the Meeting of May 19, 2005

Present:	Robert Miranda, Chair	Resident Member at Large
	Beth Noble, Vice-Chair	Resident - SHPOA Member
	Barbara Campney	Resident Member at Large
	Kilby Gibson	Resident Member at Large
	Kathy Reichert	Resident Member at Large
	Maureen Molaro	Resident - SHPOA Member
	Michael Roburn	Resident - SHPOA Member
	Carole Walker Angus	Resident - SHPOA Member
	Stewart McIntosh	BCSLA
	Michelle McMaster	BCSLA
	Steve Palmier	AIBC
	Richard Keate	Heritage Commission Representative

Regrets/Absences:		
	Derek Neale	AIBC
	Judy Ross	Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver

Recording Secretary: Margot Keate West

City Staff: Sailen Black, Development Planner
Urban Design and Development Planning Centre

AGENDA

- 1. Business**
 - Review of Minutes of April 7 and April 28, 2005
 - Recent Projects Update
- 2. Address: 1707 Angus Drive**
 - Architect: Richard Kadulski, WISA healthy homes
 - Application: Second review
- 3. Address: 1098 Wolfe Avenue**
 - Architect: Clinton Cuddington
 - Landscape Architect: Elizabeth Watts
 - Application: First Review

1. Business

- The chair welcomed and introduced Kilby Gibson and Kathy Reichert as new panel members (Residents at Large).
- **Minutes of April 7th, 2005** were reviewed, and were approved with the following changes: Corrections - Beth Noble was present. Page 4. "Addition seems enormous, overscales the house. House has doubled in volume" should be deleted. Moved, Beth seconded Maureen carried unanimously.
- **Minutes of April 28th, 2005** were reviewed and approved with the following changes: Paragraph 6 of 1.0 Business should read: "The Panel asked that the city clerk's office pursue a commitment to attend from members who have missed many meetings. Poor attendance impacts on the Panel's ability to achieve a quorum, and cannot be tolerated on a regular basis." Moved: Beth, Seconded: Michelle. Carried unanimously
- **Attendance:** Sailen advised on Panel member attendance: 4 meetings in a row without leave of absence means termination of appointment. Leave of absence must be requested and approved before the 4th absence. The Chair and Panel have to grant leave. Leave does not have to be granted. Official leave of absence requests must be brought to the Panel (sickness aside).

The Panel briefly discussed their role in interpreting versus implementing the guidelines. The Panel concluded that the reason for having 14 members was because the guidelines aren't prescriptive and need interpretation in order to be implemented.

- **Recent Projects Update**

1950 Hosmer Avenue: Guest house. Roofline of secondary buildings is distressing. Panel members will email planning regarding this for the city to look into.

2. **Address:** 1707 Angus Dr.
Architect: Richard Kadulski, WISA healthy homes
Application: Second Review

Changes to Architecture:

Apparent size and character of addition were of concern to panel last time. Roofline has been lowered, massing of addition has been pushed back from original façade.

Changes to Landscape Architecture:

Character trees are being retained. An arborist's report has been included with this application. Two trees within building envelope will be removed. Dogwood and Lawson's cypress are being removed. Six trees are being relocated. Intent is to maintain overall character. Added 5 fruit trees on plan to replace decadent trees with root rot (already removed). Also adding a street tree where one is missing. Hazelnuts are being retained for bird habitat. Wooden board fence with mixed laurel/privet hedge will be replaced with a new large plant laurel hedge along Marpole Ave. Narrowed overall driveway, and driveway cuts. Various options are being considered for the pedestrian gateway. Lych-gate option is being proposed. Gate structure mimics roofline of house.

Panel Questions:

Driveway material? brick-like coloured pavers - 3 subtle colours gives soft effect, in herringbone pattern, divided into sections by solid bands (double width).

Pedestrian pathways are all stone - some with planting, some butt-jointed (limestone and sandstone).

Materials? Cedar shingle siding (retained where possible, replaced elsewhere), painted dark grey, with cream trim and black sash windows. (similar to historic paint scheme)

Planting in between new and old? Camellia at front door has been relocated in front of new garage.

Interior? Staircase being retained. Dining room fireplace and inglenook will be reused and buffet will be moved upstairs.

Chimney retention if it's been decommissioned? Existing chimneys will be retained, new chimneys are added to addition for aesthetics, as well as mechanical venting.

Planning Comments:

Quality of detailing crucial to this project. Planning would like the Panel's comments on retention of unused chimneys (above roofline) where structure below has been removed.

Panel Comments:

Much improved. Heritage interior is still of major concern, and should be retained where at all possible.

Garage at side detracts from façade, and would be better if masked by landscaping. The panel wishes to compliment the architect, landscape architect and client for retaining this important structure and responding to panel comments. Façade would be served better without extra garage on side.

Improvements are positive. Beech tree shouldn't be disturbed and arborist report should be followed.

Beech trees are very susceptible and planning should be vigilant about how tree is handled during construction. Applaud owner/applicant for retention of house. Happy to see new wing indicates reversibility. Parking is as sensitive as it could be on such an exposed lot. 3 car garage is needed to satisfy needs of house of this proportion. Nice to see tree in between existing house and new wing (in set back area). Front porch seems underscaled. Detailing needs to be extremely robust to be successful.

Commend retention of chimneys and reuse of millwork within. Preferred brown of original paint scheme to the dark grey proposed as alternate. Gate needs to remain transparent. Please don't gild spears on fence. Thank you for great massing model. Stone wall down Marpole would add, but isn't required.

Retaining chimneys is preferable.

Motion to support with Panel comments addressed. Moved: Richard Keate; seconded: Maureen Molaro. Carried unanimously.

3. Address: 1098 Wolfe Ave.
 Architect: Clinton Cuddington
 Landscape Architect: Elizabeth Watts
 Application: First Review

Changes to Architecture:

Focused on grading and entry sequence into house. Pedestrian entrance has moved over to cluster with driveway, and increase throat of driveway to alleviate tunnel effect and improve visibility. Front façade has been tweaked. Projecting window element on upper level has cleaned up cedar wood slat siding on front. Upper balcony has been pulled over to create overhang over front door. Front cantilevered roof has been retained as is, but overhangs on other side further for dramatic effect. Increased depth of roof itself makes it more robust. Roof is more dominant than on previous applications. Stained glu-lam beams all run in one direction. Calmer, cleaner more massive roof form. Scars in front wall were mentioned - plan is to re-point whole wall, with new part stitched in to read as one (including reused material). Overall effect will be of a single homogenous wall. Addition of a new access entry point from driveway to basement. Rock wall element that divided house now bounces back and forth across hallway.

Changes to Landscape:

Existing house is lacking in terms of street continuity - rock wall is poor, with no hedge behind. Proposal is to unify streetscape with rebuilt wall and hedge screening behind. View of house is filtered from sidewalk and across street. Entry sequence steps down from front door - friendlier transition. Improved way in which house is imbedded in site. Welcoming, estate-like, layered.

Panel Questions:

Wall behind bamboo between driveway and pedestrian pathway? Finished concrete, view of which is filtered by bamboo.

Paving and stair material? Paving will be pre-cast concrete unit pavers (hopefully permeable). Lightly textured with clean lines. Stairs are poured concrete throughout (sandblasted) landing is flagstone set in gravel (acts as a transition to gravel terrace). New elements secondary to existing rock wall.

Bamboo? Timber bamboo doesn't expand with a root barrier. This will be clumping bamboo, not running. Pinus Nigra is specific type.

Security? Gates etc. are being considered, but fortifying destroys experience of FSD, and preference is to avoid this sort of thing.

Media pit? Sunken area, zone for people to sit and can also double as a family room.

Height of retaining wall? Current height is 4 ft. New retaining wall will be 4 feet gradually increasing up to 5 feet.

Access to green roof? Hatch on west side, with ladder up to second level.

Green roof? Plants specific to area are important. Vancouver Public Library has green roof. Sedums, alpines, down to meadow grasses. Small succulents. Conducting trial this summer.

Materials? Yellow cedar (blonde) hopefully salvaged, zinc for edge of roof and drip. Glu-lam beams for rafters will be stained, with soft stained finished plywood to match. Sandfloat stucco (natural) & Pavers (grey and off white)

How will Green roof be established? Temporary irrigation for first two years. New roofing systems have a reservoir system in them. Grasses are used to be dormant in summer. May go golden in summer, but plants will survive.

Cars? Three point turns will allow you to exit going forward (no need to reverse onto Wolfe).

Overlook from neighbour? 90' sideyard reduces overlook considerably.

Overall height - roof down to driveway? 25 - 30 feet.

Planning Comments:

Senior staff have reviewed and would like to hear from neighbours before proceeding to notification. If new members (both residents) have substantial concerns they should voice them now rather than later. Project clearly fulfills some aspects of Guidelines more than others and interpretation by Panel is sought.

Panel Comments:

Post 1940 existing house and landscape, with little or no value. Landscaping proposed meets heritage character of street, which is half of character of Shaughnessy. Retains lushness, maturity. Overlook is not a problem. Materials are all authentic, true to use. Great to see materials re-used for wall. Guidelines speak about retaining character of area, but replicating a traditional style wouldn't be as good as this proposal in terms of enhancing property. Roof is more prominent than last time. Procession into house is more welcoming, not as hostile. Not intimidating, but interesting. Landscape should be layered and filigreed and is successful. House meets this as well. Classic enough to wear well over time. Looking for something that enhances the property - this satisfies that in abundance. Very liveable solution.

Plan has come a long way, not sure about bamboo. Still doesn't belong in Shaughnessy. Layers are good, landscaping is interesting and well done. Building is lovely, but is a rude/hard intrusion into the landscape. Cut into landscape. Building is good. Eaves/roof are substantial and interesting. Contextual elements respond to guidelines. Proportion of landscape to house from street view is typical of Shaughnessy. Bamboo doesn't feel authentic. Remarkable house, but doesn't belong in First Shaughnessy. Would look great in west van, not in FSD. Garden is lovely. Like it. Of all the bad things that have been done to FSD, this isn't the worst. Commend applicant for responding to comments. Obligation as panel members is to test these to design guidelines. Guidelines specifically state that new houses do not have to replicate traditional styles. This adheres to the spirit of the guidelines. Bamboo is an exotic, as are monkey trees and other species already present in FSD. Yellow cedar isn't too bright. There are many examples of post and beam architecture and contemporary houses in Shaughnessy. Richness to design is nice. Overhanging portion of house over garage, driveway and retaining wall are harsh. Jarring factors are where strongly cut edges fall off. If edge was strengthened, and overhang was screened better it would be more effective. Pleased to see revision of front entry. Argument that this isn't Shaughnessy is paired by the site, which isn't particularly first Shaughnessy either. Bamboo speaks to Japanese garden across street. Looking 50 yrs ahead, bamboo may be impermanent, so maybe wall behind should be stone clad. Floating railing is great idea - playful.

Green roof speaks to future of Shaughnessy. Interesting, a house that begs passers-by to stop and look at it. Very attractive. This style doesn't speak to other houses in Shaughnessy.

Planting list/plan - plants are small, would be nice to see plants upsized (hedging, trees should be larger). Owner/ applicant is full of enthusiasm, and it shows. Shaughnessy isn't a museum, and can change while respecting the existing pre-1940 character. Nondescript house being replaced by something more interesting.

Motion to support in principle. Moved : Richard Keate; seconded: Michelle McMaster. 8 for, 4 against (Michael Roburn asked be named as being against).

Motion to return with Panel comments addressed: Moved: Steve Palmier, Seconded: Carole Walker Angus. 4 for, 6 against.

Meeting adjourned at 6:15