



City of Vancouver
Community Services Group
Current Planning

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

Minutes of the Meeting of June 8, 2006

Present:	Beth Noble, Chair	Resident - SHPOA Member
	Barbara Campney	Resident Member at Large
	Kilby Gibson	Resident Member at Large
	Kathy Reichert	Resident Member at Large
	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:	Maureen Molaro	Resident - SHPOA Member
	Derek Neale	AIBC
	Judy Ross	Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver
	Vacancy	Resident Member at Large

Recording Secretary: Kilby Gibson

City Staff: Sailen Black, Development Planner, UDDPC

AGENDA

4:00 Business; 1. Review of the Minutes of May 18, 2006
 2. Recent Projects Update

4:15 Address: **1833 West 17th Avenue**
Applicant: Jonathan Ehling, Architect
Description: Demolition of a post-1940's residence and construction of a single family residence
Status: First Review (DE410308)

I. Business

1. **Minutes of May 18, 2006** were reviewed, and were approved as presented.
Moved: Michelle McMaster; Seconded: Beth Noble. Carried unanimously.
2. **Project Updates:** None to Report.
3. **Panel Member Status:** Brief discussion as to current status of some FSAD Panel members.
Waiting further information from City staff. Tabled to the next meeting.

Address: 1833 West 17th Avenue
Applicant: Jonathan Ehling Architect
Description: Demolition of a post-1940's residence and construction of a single family residence
Status: First Review (DE410308)

Program:

The Landscape architect was unable to attend this meeting. Since last before the Panel, the porch has been amended to a single element and extends to the second floor. The pitch of the roof has been increased and the height increased to 33 ft. 8 in. There are now proposed larger, higher windows on the main floor, a brick masonry basing, a central dormer gable and a light well to a storage room below.

Panel Questions:

- The applicant was asked about proposed changes to the basement floor plan, specifically the change of bedroom to storage room (no windows).
- Asked if the fireplace was gas? Yes
- Questions concerning the visible brick around skirt to base of windows, front fence and low front wall. Question as to whether it was full brick. Yes. Other Panel members questioned why the use of brick rather than granite or stone cladding?
- Questions regarding choice of paint colours - pale green field, dark green trim with yellow window trim. Was it in keeping with Georgian style?
- Many questions regarding the use of polyurethane (composite product) for the window headers- applicant explained it does not rot like wood, looks the same. Panel would like to see product sample.
- Fence material is to be brick, not stone clad, and questions regarding use of aluminium instead of wrought iron for the fencing. Further concern regarding porch support for wrought iron which a member felt needed better finishing and quality. Panel asked whether they support use of such lower cost materials.
- Question regarding symmetry of roof.
- Panel wanted to know what material would be used for the wall ramping down the driveway (unclad, smooth concrete). General concerns about authenticity of materials throughout the project.
- Questions about the chimney and whether it was substantial enough. Planning to decide.
- Questions regarding landscaping, specifically should Planning pursue additional details on landscaping? Could there be a major tree planted in the back as opposed to just shrubbery.
- Concern was raised about the many different varieties of windows and questions if they are consistent with Georgian style. Would like to see more consistency in windows. Other members would like to see more filigree in front.

Planning Questions

- Does Panel support use of low-maintenance or lower-cost painted foam detailing on this particular building?
- Is the Panel in support of the overall form and the composition of each façade?
- Does the Panel wish the Planning Department to pursue additional development in detail of exterior finishes and landscape to FSD standards in the Guidelines and ODP?

Panel Comments:

- wanted bedroom windows fixed by possibly extending eaves to eliminate flat roof
- general concern regarding foam (polystyrene) treatment over windows-could break up - most panel members would like to see wood
- more filigree wanted
- colours are muddy-not Georgian?
- aluminum fencing a concern-should be wrought iron and black in colour
- facades should have a constant look so it looks like the same house on all sides e.g. some 3/9 windows in front and some 6/6 in rear, some bays- too much variety for a Georgian- Planning should look at detailing
- concern about overall economy of materials instead of natural materials and a closer attention to details and supported material
- opposition to brick wall detailing, prefer granite - if brick, continue using well up to the first floor, if heavy dash, use granite
- light well is fine
- landscape generally acceptable but no trees in front - would like to see a major tree to knock off symmetry. Flat lawn not rich or luxurious.
- pitch and roof were acceptable.

Applicant Response

Client preference was the reason for many of the design choices. Mr. Ehling defended the use of composite product around the windows but does not feel it will be a contentious issue. The colours for the home were chosen by the client. He felt the slope of the roof was consistent with the ridge height. He was willing to consider a change in planting by the front entry.

Motion 1:

"The Panel supports this project with comments addressed, in particular:

- rear and side elevation concerns
- authenticity of materials
- filigree and layering to be consistent with FSDP policy
- robustness of details"

Proposed by Richard Keate; Seconded by Michelle McMaster.
Carried with Michael Roburn opposed.

Motion 2:

That the fence and base be granite instead of brick.

Proposed by Steve Palmier, Seconded by Beth Noble
Tied -

Motion 3:

That issue of fence and base materials be deferred to Planning Department.

Proposed by Steve Palmier, Seconded by Beth Noble
Carried

The meeting adjourned at