

## First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

### Minutes of the Meeting of February 1, 2007

<b>Present:</b>	Kilby Gibson Kathy Reichert Michael Roburn Carole Walker Angus Maureen Molaro Stewart McIntosh Derek Neale Richard Keate	Resident Member at Large Resident Member at Large Resident - SHPOA Member Resident - SHPOA Member Resident - SHPOA Member BCSLA AIBC Heritage Commission Representative
<b>Regrets/Absences:</b>	Beth Noble, Chair Barbara Campney Michelle McMaster Steve Palmier Judy Ross	Resident - SHPOA Member Resident Member at Large BCSLA AIBC Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver
<b>Recording Secretary:</b>	Margot Keate West	
<b>City Staff:</b>	Sailen Black, Development Planner, UDDPC Gerry Mcgeough, Heritage Planner	

### AGENDA

- 4:00 **Business:** 1. Review of the Minutes of Nov. 23, 2006 and Site Visit Jan. 11, 2007  
2. Recent Projects Update
- 4:15 **Address: 1438 Balfour Avenue**  
**Applicant:** Stuart Howard Architects Inc.  
**Description:** To construct a single family residence on this vacant lot with patio, pool and hot tub in the rear yard.  
**Enquiry:** First
- 5:00 **Address: 1628 Marpole Avenue**  
**Applicant:** Donna Chomichuk, Landscape Architect  
**Description:** To review a proposed fence design between 1628 & 1638 Marpole Avenue  
**Enquiry:** Second
- 5:45 **Address: 1402 McRae Avenue**  
**Applicant:** Jim Bussey, Formwerks Architectural Inc.  
**Description:** To retain the Nichol house in-situ as a single family residence with its front yard, using a Heritage Revitalization Agreement and Designation; and to rezone the balance of the site to CD-1 permitting development of two multi-family townhouses with a total of 15 dwelling units.  
**Enquiry:** First

I. Business

1. Minutes of the meeting of Nov. 23, 2006 were incomplete; therefore their review and those of the site visit on Jan. 11, 2007 were deferred to the next meeting.

2. Projects Update:

Upcoming projects:

- **1576 W. 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue:** Proposal has been scaled back and will be approved as a small addition. It will not be coming back to the Panel.
- 
- **1751 Cedar Crescent:** Renovation work. It will not be coming to the Panel as scope is small.
- 
- **3369 The Crescent:** Application to install swimming pool and pool house. Reno to entry gate, driveway and patio. It will not be coming to the Panel.

**Address:** 1438 Balfour Avenue

**Applicant:** Stuart Howard Architects Inc.

**Description:** To construct a single family residence on this vacant lot with patio, pool and hot tub in the rear yard.

**Enquiry:** First

**Program:**

Proposed house is arts and crafts, with tripartite expression with a variety of dormers and varying peak heights. Building is generally 1 room deep, and L-shaped in plan. Stone on base, stucco on mid level, with shingles on top with cedar shingle roof. Wood windows, heavy timber detailing. Plan and siting are in response to need to open up site for light, and to allow pool in back to be in the sun. Underground garage accessed from east side. Driveway takes advantage of existing openings in original granite fence. Sunken courtyards for parking and for nanny's room and exercise/party room. Also provides access to pool from basement. Landscaping: Driveway as existing openings dictate. Intensely used courtyard in back southwest corner. Have tried to tie interior space with outdoors by using arbours/trellises etc.

**Panel Questions:**

- Walkway east of driveway? Stone.
- Storm-water retention ? Yes, there will be a tank on site, as site has been vacant for a number of years.
- Planting? Large hedge on south side will be replaced with something more friendly.
- Pool safety? Four ft of hard surface on all sides
- Detail between driveway and back yard? Three levels of planters with stairs to the side. There will also be a gate on each side of the house to back yard at some point.
- Trees being removed? South property line Western red cedar hedge will be removed. Will be replaced with another type of cedar hedge, smaller and more manageable. Two other large trees (in bad shape) are being replaced because they are both within the building envelope.
- Trees on east side? Five feet between interior side of retaining wall and existing trees.
- Arborist's report? No, not yet.
- Difficult landscape areas to design with this plan? Tightness of driveway along east property line.
- Location of storm water? In front yard, shouldn't impact on trees.
- Why is front façade so symmetrical? Plan is essentially axial, but variety is given to elevation by roof elements that break up horizontal plane.
- Paving materials? Driveway will be concrete paver, walkways and patio will be slate and granite.
- Banding around house? Stone-like product (fiber cement product). Applied as a masonry element. Like Haddington stone - reconstituted stone.
- Casing around window bays? Painted wood
- Stone on base? Taupey-grey - warm grey natural stone. Still searching for product
- Window detail? Stone sill about 5" thick runs around house. Window sill sits on top of it. North, East and West elevations all have this.
- Room above porte-cochere? Yes
- Top gable in roof? Lights a secondary stair

**Planning Comments:**

Planning is looking for comments on landscape and architectural design proposed.

**Panel Comments:**

Thank applicants for a good application for enquiry stage. Overall approach and idea are good. Symmetry is kind of disturbing. How house effects driveway is a problem - seems squished. Concerned about size and location of storm water retention tank. Driveway where it access back yard is awkward. Termination of driveway on east property line is of concern. No filigree to screen driveway from street. Back yard programming and design look simple and elegant. Massing of house seems too symmetrical. Vocabulary of house and landscape suit site and neighbourhood. Filigree on driveway is essential - neighbours don't like tunnel effect of underground garage accesses. Like the room over porte-cochere - like Sen. Shatford house on The Crescent at Tecumseh. Garage doors should be painted out like stone. Nice to keep as many mature trees as possible. Unsure of stone material and would like to see a sample. Coloured renderings help. Massing model would be nice for application. Roofline is good. Grade down to garage seems subtle - not too severe. Nice to see porte-cochere integrated and tied back in to house. Volume is very pleasant. Central entrance and circular driveway work well. Nice complete package. Front walkway feels like it should be wider or needs some interest. Trellis and pool look great.

**Motion:** To support to come back as an application with comments addressed. Moved: Richard Keate; seconded: Kilby Gibson; Carried unanimously.

**Address:** 1628 Marpole Avenue

**Applicant:** Donna Chomichuk, Landscape Architect

**Description:** To review a proposed fence design between 1628 & 1638 Marpole Avenue

**Enquiry:** Second

**Program:**

Last presentation included history of site and HRA. Panel voted to remove a clause from the HRA on this property that stipulated that the property line between 1628 and 1638 should not be either fenced or planted. New approach is as soft as possible - planting solution. Six ft. cedar hedge would sit on property of 1638 Marpole, with a 4 ft. chain-link fence the inside of hedge on property line (facing 1628 Marpole). Simpler look from street. Frames heritage house. Structural planting with filigree in front and behind. 1638 has some plants that may be re-arranged in front of hedge. Added planting at North east corner at 1638 site to soften views of 1628 from street. Hedge keeps things clean, simple and understandable Complementary to the style of the house. Softer than any fence. Filigree behind hedge will be produced as part of a separate application. This application deals with landscape of 1638 and property line. Old fence will remain beyond view line (towards the back of the lots). Maintenance of hedge would be responsibility of 1638 Marpole. Currently a gentleman's agreement. Existing chain link fence at front property line was installed by previous owner at same time as wooden fence. Wooden fence is the most prominent of the non conformities on this site.

**Panel Questions:**

- Is there a provision for maintaining hedges at a certain height? Legalities can be answered by the city. Not sure how it can be insured.
- Purpose of chain link? To keep children in, keep skunks, coyotes and racoons out. Want to save budget for visible planting. Black vinyl coated chain link. Once planting plan is complete it will not be visible from either side.
- Will there be an application for planting on 1638? No: Application will be brought for work to be done on 1628.
- Can a letter of consent/ agreement from the neighbouring property be provided with the application? Yes.
- Application for planting? Within the next few months.

**Planning Comments:**

Bearing in mind the agreement to remove HRA clause governing the fence, we're looking for comments based on FSD principles.

**Panel Comments:**

Hard to get plants to grow through in some locations, but light here looks good. Uncomfortable with legalities of agreement between owner, especially re: height. A written agreement would be more supportable. Owners of 1628 should have the right to maintain height of hedge at any time. In favour of hedge - much softer solution than a fence. Expresses the sense of enclosure that the guidelines talk about. Hedge is best way to go. Successful. Concerned about approving chain link because of precedent. Chain link is not an approved material

**Motion:** To support this enquiry with comments addressed. Further that letters of agreement be exchanged to limit the height of the hedge, and providing that both the owners of 1628 and 1638 have the right to maintain the hedge. Moved: Richard Keate, seconded: Stewart McIntosh. Carried unanimously: Seven for, one against.

**Motion:** That this proceed as an application without another review by the panel. Moved: Richard Keate, Seconded: Kilby Gibson. Carried unanimously.

**Address:** 1402 McRae Avenue with Nichol House and 3238 Granville Street, Vacant Lot  
**Applicant:** Jim Bussey, Formwerks Architectural Inc.  
**Landscape:** Paul Sangha, Landscape Architect  
**Description:** To retain the Nichol house in-situ as a single family residence with its front yard, using a Heritage Revitalization Agreement and Designation; and to rezone the balance of the site to CD-1 permitting development of two multi-family townhouses with a total of 15 dwelling units.  
**Enquiry:** First  
**Rezoning Planner:** Vicky Potter  
**Heritage Planner:** Gerry McGeough

### Introduction by Planning:

#### Brief History

An inquiry received October 2005 by Larry Beasley, Co-Director of Planning, proposing to:

- Relocate and preserve the Heritage A -listed Nichol House;
- Develop townhouses in proximity to Granville Street; and
- Maintain the overall or total density of the combined lots at 0.45 FSR.

Then in November, 2005, the Director of Planning replied that staff were supportive of house retention and the concept of redeveloping the site in an economically viable way. However, Council's Heritage Policies required determination of whether there was economic hardship in preserving the house, and in turn, what amount of compensation (density or otherwise) would be appropriate to offset the cost. At the time, staff could not make this determination, and hence, could not offer a comprehensive evaluation but subdivision was not supported.

However, staff did make the following observations:

- Early consultation with the local community was essential. Earlier experience with Greencroft which resulted in 1 ½ years of debate and four nights of Public Hearing: AVOID.
- Relocation of the Nichol House was not supported.
- Processing as an HRA versus a rezoning would likely hinge on the form of housing proposed.
- Real Estate Services and the proponents, after working together, met in July 2006 to review the economically viable options for the site in, one of which was to keep the Heritage House in situ, subdivide the land so it has its own parcel and develop the remainder to the west at 0.60 FSR as multiple family dwellings.

#### Community Workshops

The proponents agreed to organize in a series of community workshops to be facilitated by the City to explore the various development options on the site, including the owner's preferred option.

- Between November 1st and 21st, 2006, a series of four community meetings were held at the Vancouver Lawn Tennis and Badminton Club.
- The FSAD Panel nominated Beth Noble, Michelle McMaster, Judy Ross and Kilby Gibson to attend. Representatives of SHPOA (Shaughnessy Heights Property Owners Association) and the VHC (Vancouver Heritage Commission) also attended, along with neighbours from nearby properties.
- At the third meeting, there was general concern from the group:
  - from a heritage perspective: relocating the house
  - from SHPOA perspective: introducing uses and forms (multiple dwelling) seen as foreign to an FSD zoned lot.
  - from the proponent's perspective: Although disappointed with the lack of community support for the preferred scheme, returned to the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting with a revised option to keep the house in place and develop a 2-storey townhouse along Granville, and a 3-storey townhouse in the middle. The outcome was much more positive and supportive. While concern remained over introducing row housing to FSD, the new option appeared to strike a balance between the different interests at stake.

A follow-up e-mail was sent in January, 2007 to all participants from Scott Barker, Facilitator:

I would like to thank you again for your participation last November in the "co-design" process for this unique site at 1402 McRae Avenue. I hope that you found this process both interesting and informative as the group attempted to understand and brainstorm some general development options for this site. I know that this process has allowed city staff, you as interested neighbours, as well as Mr. Bell and his team, to get a better sense of some of the opportunities and challenges for any redevelopment on this site, and I hope you would agree that this was a valuable exercise.

At this point, the applicant team is in the process of further developing the scheme presented in our last co-design meeting on November 21st. Should the scheme ultimately presented to the city be generally in keeping with the discussion of this day, it is anticipated that a rezoning application would be submitted. A rezoning process (to a CD-1) would be undertaken for the lower (west) portion of the site, and the upper (east) portion of the site (containing the Nichol House) would be retained as FSD Zoning, with a Heritage Revitalization Agreement and designation securing retention. Staff believe that such a combined process would be the most effective way to consider the introduction of a use and form not generally found in the FSD area (the rezoning process), while also securing the long-term preservation of the existing heritage house in the First Shaughnessy District (HRA process).

Should a formal rezoning and development application be received by the city in the near future, staff review would include advisory input from the First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel, the Vancouver Heritage Commission, the Urban Design Panel, and of course from interested members of the neighbourhood. It is also expected that prior to any decision on this application, the city will host a public open house/information meeting in order to allow neighbors to better understand the proposal, and to invite further feedback.

Ultimately, City Council will be asked to make a decision on any such rezoning application and HRA at a Public Hearing to be scheduled several months following the formal application submission.

- After the FSAD Panel has had a chance to ask questions for clarification, I will offer questions from Planning

**Program:**

To retain the Nichol house *in situ* as a single family residence with its historic front and east side (and retaining wall) yard, using a HRA and designation; and to rezone the balance of the site to CD-1 permitting a development of two rows of multi-family townhouses with a total of 15 dwelling units.

**Background:** Careful community consultation has been undertaken. Oct 2005 the city saw an enquiry to preserve and relocate the Nichol house with townhouses at lower level (Granville and 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue). Proposal was to redevelop at .45 FSR for the overall site.

**Three Observations:** Community consultation early on indicated that relocation of Nichol house would not be supported. HRA vs. rezoning would depend on the form of development proposed. Real estate services met to determine the financial considerations. Four community meetings were held. There was a sense of concern expressed in regards to the relocation of house. Land use was a problem. Ultimately, City council will have final say as HRA's and rezonings both have to be approved by Council.

**Rezoning:** Ms. Potter will be overseeing this application (once it is made) though the system with a combined rezoning and redevelopment permit process. HRA on one part of property, and rezoning of other portion to CD1. CD-1 will not be moved forward with until HRA is in place. Provides security. Process: Rezoning enquiry; preliminary input by public and staff; rezoning application; review by public; review by staff and advisory groups; staff analysis and conclusions; report and recommendations to Council. At this point it is either refused or there will be another Public Hearing, at this point it can be refused or it will be approved, then become subject to conditions. When the conditions are satisfied, the by-law is enacted. It is a 7 to 9 month process.

**Heritage:** Significant public process already undertaken. Co-design workshop tried to bring up and grapple with all of the challenges and all views were heard. Rezoning can be used to achieve heritage goals where policy will not allow it to otherwise succeed. Goal is to follow ODP and FSD Guidelines where they can achieve what is necessary. The form of development on this site is better achieved by re-zoning than HRA. More palatable with townhouse portion dealt with as a rezoning.

**Owner:** Process has taken 18 months so far. Reasonable plan of development has been modified to the point where parties concerned are excited about outcome. Ideas for design and rationale have come from this process. With retention of house *in situ* and surroundings, nothing much has been proposed for the front lot, fairly minimal impact. Balance of site has been approached with the intent of the ODP and FSD guidelines/style in mind, using building types found elsewhere in the city. Proposed style of architecture is taken from Shannon and Hycroft (classical/beaux arts in flavour) as a contrast to the main house, rather than doing a watered down version of the arts and crafts style.

**Architecture:** Fifth Avenue cinemas, 4<sup>th</sup> and Yew bank building, 45<sup>th</sup> and Macdonald all by this developer and of great quality. Interests of heritage house are well taken care of. Five unit town house unit is set back. Height of these is kept lower, but remaining high enough to see over lower townhouses. Will not be dominant in relation to main house.

Lower townhouses hinge on pivot point of top townhouse (or gatehouse). Stone of existing stone wall will be carried up at this point, providing a focus. Townhouses are being designed to be seen from Granville and will be of a quality to be seen. Ample parking provided on site, with 2 spots below each unit plus visitor parking. New driveway access will be slightly uphill from existing cut. Instead of two curb cuts there will be one for both townhouse groupings.

Meets most of ODP with the exception of single family references. Rows of townhouses have similar properties. Cross ventilation, no neighbours above or below, individual front doors and street presence. Have tried to keep as many benefits of single family living as possible within townhouse format. Keeping to intent of Heritage (keeping house), substance of application is townhouse addition. Addressing off street parking.

Asking for minor relaxation for pivot building (pulled out to give it more dominance) - front yard setback relaxation. Allowable floor space 46,758 sq. ft. This is what is proposed. Allowable above-grade FSR is ? 30 476, proposing all 46,758 above grade. This would serve as compensation for dominant public benefit of heritage house that is being retained and is tied to this structure.

Seems like a friendly, neighbourly type of relaxation to ask for. Neighbours appear to be disapproving of density transfer. Above/below grade FSR relaxation means that the townhouses will be livable, and in keeping with the neighbourhood.

**Landscape:** Series of ponds and streams in back yard. Back yards are somewhat private and very livable. Planting will help to screen Granville Street and McRae Avenue.

Layered look on corner of 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Granville, breaks down as it moves up McRae Avenue. Maintain and repairing existing stone wall. Raised pedestrian streetscape benefits row house units. Driveway allows for turnaround, while providing an attractive view up the driveway up the steps into the garden. Front garden of main house is of heritage value. Side yard is left over space. Garage will be relocated here. Pool will go where existing garage is. Layering between principle residence and townhouses adjacent. Retaining wall of same material as townhouses will be in back yards of townhomes. To mitigate some noise a stream way will be introduced. A more natural landscape in back. Gives units a view of a larger landscape. Property lines blurred so that each unit isn't bound by lines. Meandering path around stream way.

From the street, two connection points will provide access to Granville and 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

#### Panel Questions:

- Spirit of FSD ODP and Guidelines applies to CD1 rezoning? Yes, and where proposal departs, a rationale will be given. Owner wants it to fit within neighbourhood but needs to fit the site. Purpose of rezoning is to achieve something that the ODP will not allow. Owner has to outline which aspects of the zoning won't allow it to work, the balance is considered in relation to existing zoning where possible.
- Will house site be subdivided? Yes. House will be on its own lot and left as one unit.
- Density proposed would not be possible without the HRA? No. Rezoning would not be considered without HRA. Locks in for the City the designation of the heritage house.
- HRA will protect exterior of the house only? Yes. House is in sound condition. Needs an upgrade of wiring and plumbing, but doesn't need 'restoration'. All very original.
- Can you provide sections though the site? Yes.
- Will CD1 be removed from FSD? Yes.
- Resulting FSR for Nichol house property? No more development on site.
- Can Nichol house be turned into a multiple conversion dwelling after HRA? Can be raised as a concern if you wish. Intention is to lock in house as a single family dwelling at this point. Further development would require renegotiation of HRA. Will also include maintenance requirements for house.
- Will restoration of original landscape be part of HRA? Can be if those comments are discussed at the Panel, and it is seen to be desirable.
- -DP and rezoning will include Panel at all points? Yes, rezoning piece, HRA piece and design.
- -DE's for both West and East parcels will come back to Panel even after CD1 zoning goes through? Yes, Panel will see proposals for both lots. Owner would like the input of the Panel, as there is still a responsibility to create something within the spirit of FSD.
- Other schemes considered? Yes. Twelve to 15 schemes worked though. Four sessions with co-design group included meetings to discuss the regulatory environment and a site visit; discuss what was important; discuss options generated; consider final scheme and critique. Massing, siting, building form were discussed, but finer points of design were not.
- Total number of units? Sixteen: One in house, 5 larger townhouses, 10 smaller (from 1000 sq ft. +)
- Parking? In the range of 50 spots: 2 per unit, plus one visitor per unit +/-
- Townhouse roof form? Flat roof, green roofs and roof decks are being contemplated.

- Can townhouses be developed as freehold? It can be explored. It may have been done elsewhere in the City. Very hard to do freehold on this site.
- Thought given to emergency vehicle and firefighting access? Yes, will be checked; flagged if there is a problem.
- Two lots or three proposed? Two: One for main house, one for townhouses.
- Security? Yes. Access for underground parking will be secured as will the top of the stairs from Granville Street. Walkways will be secured. Intent is to pay attention to security for residents.
- Trees between main house and townhouses? Mix of evergreen and deciduous. Meant to obscure view of townhouses from main house and vice versa.
- Size of turnaround? Large enough to turn without having to back on to street.
- Walls behind middle townhouses? Masonry wall - either brick or stone, 6 or 7 feet high; like a walled garden.
- Broadleaf evergreens? Rhododendrons and camellias underneath deciduous trees.
- Garage will be retained? No, can't be moved, new garage will be needing a relaxation for side yard.
- Storm water? Depends on stream, but any underground retention system will be in the form of a filtration field rather than a cistern field.
- Parking for deliveries? Probably on other side of McRae Avenue. Not into that level of detail yet.
- Garbage collection? Small compacting bin that is serviced by small scale truck. Central compaction system.
- Water system? Storm water as part of pond? Exploring it.
- Gathering areas, outdoor areas? Benches, bridges etc. but other common spaces haven't yet been considered. Outdoor spaces are currently oriented towards single units.
- Chosen style? Flat roofs stepped down are easier than peaked roofs.

#### Planning Comments:

*Proposal is striking balance between retention and existing zoning. Looking for commentary on departures:*

- *Above grade FSR*
- *Side and front setbacks*
- *Number of dwelling units*
- *Townhouse form*
- *Looking for comments on Middle townhouse siting and orientation*
- *Primary concerns are the overall size, use, massing, and density.*
- *Style character comments appreciated.*
- *Other aspects of architecture and landscape proposed.*

#### Planning Questions:

Noting the overall goal to balance retention of the house and yard with existing FSD zoning, staff is:

1. Looking for commentary on the departures from current policy, including:
  - Above grade FSR
  - Side and rear yard setbacks
  - Form and use: multiple dwellings; 15 new dwelling units; townhouse form
2. Looking for commentary on the siting and orientation of the middle townhouse, noting that the proposal will offer better private views to the west but may pose challenges compared with the typical principle building.
3. Although our primary concern at this pre-application stage is Form of Development, we would be open to guidance on the building style and character suggested.
4. Looking for FSAD Panel's comments on the architectural and landscape design proposed.

#### Panel Comments:

Like a lot of what is being presented. Don't have a problem with FSR. Given topography and parking, no problem with above grade FSR relaxation. Unusual site, and setbacks don't impact on street in a way that it would elsewhere in FSD. Setback relaxations are fine. Very supportive of this type of housing. Relationship of main house to middle townhouses is poor. There needs to be more of a definite pedestrian entrance into site. Consider turning middle building around to attach to gatehouse - pull away from main house. Keep back yards very private. No problem contrasting style of heritage house. Beautiful arts and crafts townhouses on Hemlock (1920's) are worth considering. Landscaping in front yard of heritage house is underwhelming. Intent of MacLure House was to do a Lutyens garden like Greenery gardens, but it has been lost. Great start. Appreciate effort to date.



Like it. Wonderful use of property that is currently a no-man's land. Little bit dense, but water feature is great. Great to retain heritage house on its own lot. General approach architecturally is good. Site looks a bit crowded. Explore reorientation of middle townhouses. Might help with privacy issues. Smallest townhouse seems too close to 5 cedars. Like gatehouse entrance. Would like to see a gathering space in garden. Access from all units into central garden. Nice to see storm water worked into stream water feature. Restoration of garden would be wonderful - would be interesting to hear what Heritage would support in reference to the gardens.

Thank applicant for being so amenable. Pleased with how project has progressed. Above ground FSR and setback relaxations are supportable. Number of dwellings is okay. Pivot is good. Arts and crafts townhouses might look watered down next to main house. Better off relating to Hycroft. Indian centre on Yew and 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. Brick is not common in Shaughnessy. Something softer might settle in better. Like layered effect of topography. Controls glimpses of Nichol house from downhill side. Density might feel stronger if townhouses are cranked around and attached at gate house (which would be negative). Landscape - lutyens approach. Butchart gardens would be good for inspiration. Granite walls should be retained and pulled into site. Keep pantry in main house. Thanks for amount of work - really exciting.

Middle townhouse feels a bit awkward. Needs pedestrian access to 5 middle town homes aside from driveway. Doesn't feel safe. Landscape is very attractive and works well. Privacy of Main house is compromised by adjacency of middle townhouses. Unhappy with increased density. Look forward to seeing restored garden. Emergency access seems to be a problem.

Community facility is worth considering. Consider reducing height of middle townhouses.

**Response:**

Siting has a lot to do with topography. Situation between house and middle townhouses is tight, but it's a fact of the property. Screening can be done well. Attaching middle townhouses makes for a more dense looking project. Area between house and middle townhouses is 55 ft. Trying to hide density within slope. By moving middle houses around, it starts to impinge on the neighbouring house (5 Cedars).

Garden of that period rather than a restoration of the original would be interesting. Will explore community space/ gathering spaces. Access from all town houses to garden was intended. Pedestrian access to street to five middle townhouses is a great suggestion.

**Motion:** To support the project at 1402 McRae Avenue as presented with comments addressed. Moved: Richard Keate; Seconded: Derek Neale. Carried: 7 for, one opposed.

Meeting adjourned at 8:15