



CITY OF VANCOUVER  
Community Services Group  
Current Planning

## First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

Minutes of the Meeting of May 18, 2006

**Present:**

Michael Roburn, Acting 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
Carole Walker Angus	Resident - SHPOA Member
Michelle McMaster	BCSLA
Derek Neale	AIBC
Steve Palmier	AIBC
Judy Ross	Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver

**Regrets/Absences:**

Robert Miranda, Chair	Resident Member at Large	Resigned
Beth Noble, Vice-Chair	Resident - SHPOA Member	
Richard Keate	Heritage Commission Representative	
Stewart McIntosh	BCSLA	

**Recording Secretary:** Michael Roburn

**City Staff:** Dale Morgan, Development Planner, UDDPC

### AGENDA

4:00 **Business:**

1. Review of the Minutes of April 27, 2006
2. Recent Projects Update

4:15 **Address:** 1488 Laurier Avenue  
**Applicant:** Loy Leyland, Architect  
**Description:** Demolition of the pre-1940's house and construction of a single family residence.  
**Application:** Second

**I. Business**

1. **Minutes of April 27, 2006** were considered. No changes to the draft minutes were proposed. The minutes were approved.
  
2. **Project updates:** There was no update as Dale Morgan was in attendance for Sailen Black.

**Address:** 1488 Laurier Avenue  
**Applicant:** Loy Leyland, Architect  
**Landscaping:** Ito and Associates  
**Description:** Demolition of pre-1940 house and construction of a single family residence.  
**Application:** Second.

The first application was presented to the Panel on April 27, 2006. The first motion "to support the house as presented" was defeated. The second motion "to see this application to return as an enquiry with comments addressed" was passed.

**Program:**

The applicant was asked about the proposed changes to the previous plan. *(The following paraphrases his words as well as his responses to the Panel's questions).*

It is not proposed to move the house back. It is also not proposed to raise the main floor. The roof will be raised 6 to 8 inches, which will increase the pitch of the roof. The basement floor will be raised 6 inches - this will lower the basement ceiling. The terrace at the back of the house will be raised a little, but it cannot be connected to the driveway. The depth of the terrace will be reduced from the originally planned 10 1/2 feet and it will be softened with a large planting area surrounding it.

The planned stucco on the outside of the basement will be replaced with granite. The turret roof will be zinc. Balcony floors will be concrete tile. Balcony railings will be robust wood. The ground floor columns will be granite. The roof will be dark gray duroid, as good quality cedar shingles are difficult to obtain and modern duroid can be quite attractive and durable.

The body of the house will be changed to Edwardian Pewter, and the trim to Oxford Ivory.

The window well will be big enough for the nanny to escape in case of a fire. The grate will be hinged to ease opening.

The back driveway will have concrete pavers. The front driveway will have concrete pavers with a grass strip in the middle. The retention tank will be under the front driveway, to preserve trees. The sunken patio will be moved to the south. Some of the planters will be bigger than previously proposed. There will be more filigree.

**Acting Chair's Summary:**

*Many comments were made during the meeting of April 27th, some of them overlapping - three wanted the house set back, two wanted subdued colours, two asked for less cement and two wanted more filigree. Other comments asked to raise the house, to have tripartite expression, more grass and more prominent planters. One thought massing to be too aggressive, others asked for a cedar roof, and to connect the back driveway and the sunken terrace. The basement should have stone siding, not stucco. Regret the loss of the heritage house.*

*The applicant implemented several of the comments, but was not able to accommodate others, either because regulations don't permit them (e.g. raising the roof more than 6-8 inches and connecting the terrace to the back driveway), or because of practical difficulties (e.g. increasing the front setback, which would limit backyard space}.*

*Granite will replace stucco for base. There will be grass in the middle of the front driveway. The colours will be more subdued. More filigree. Bigger planters. The roof will remain duroid. The house setback was not increased. The back driveway and the terrace will not be connected. The house will not be raised.*

**Planning Comments:**

Raising the house will require reducing the amount of excavation, to change overall height above grade averages. Guidelines allow varied front setbacks. The height of the main floor above grade is directly related to the depth and extent of exterior excavation, not the basement level.

*Section 1.4.2 of FSODP: "New development should be carefully sited to retain as many mature trees and as much of the existing topography and vegetation on the property as possible".*

**Panel Comments:**

The Panel appreciated the changes made by the applicant in response to its comments of April 27.

The Panel's comments were generally in favour of the proposed design and of the detailing. The three main issues discussed were: the front yard setback, the lack of tripartite expression and the grades in the rear, especially the depth of the terrace.

Several of the Panel members were in favour of raising the main floor of the house so that a tripartite expression could be achieved. Lifting the house would help if regulations allow it. Doing so would require a reduction of high ceiling levels on the main and second floors, as the roof cannot be raised any more than proposed.

There was no consensus on the front yard setback, with some asking for a larger setback, others accepting the proposed one. The proposal is putting the house in front of the two neighbouring houses, and the porte cochere will reduce the visual effect further. It was pointed out that front yard depths in the neighbourhood are not uniform - they vary in depth.

*Page 9 of the FS Design Guidelines says: "Above the line of fences, houses are sited at varying distances from the street and are seen through a thin veil consisting of the layering and filigree of tree and shrub branches."*

Concern was expressed at the proposed depth of the terrace at the back, and at the lack of connection between it and the rear driveway

**Motion 1:**

"The Panel supports the project as presented today". Proposed by Maureen Molaro; seconded by Kilby Gibson. The motion was put to vote: Four were in favour, five were against. The motion was defeated.

*The ensuing discussion made it clear that the Panel did not wish to reject the proposal, but it wanted all of its comments to be addressed by the applicant, with special emphasis on raising the building and tripartite expression. A second motion was then proposed:*

**Motion 2:**

"The Panel supports this project with comments addressed, specifically in the area of front yard setback, tripartite expression and raising the building". Proposed by Maureen Molaro; seconded by Kathy Reichert.

**Amendment to Motion 2:**

To remove the words "front yard setback". Proposed by Derek Neale; seconded by Kathy Reichert. The **amended motion** was put to vote and was passed :

"The Panel supports this project with comments addressed, specifically in the area of tripartite expression and of raising the building".