

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

Minutes of the Meeting of March 15, 2007

NO QUORUM

Present:

Kathy Reichert, vice chair	Resident Member at Large
Lori Kozub	Resident - SHPOA Member
Carole Walker Angus	Resident - SHPOA Member
Donna Aitken	Resident - SHPOA Member
Elizabeth Whitelaw	BCSLA
Derek Neale	AIBC
Judy Ross	Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver
Michelle McMaster	BCSLA
Clinton Cuddington	AIBC

Regrets/Absences:

Beth Noble, Chair	Resident - SHPOA Member
Mamie Angus	Resident Member at Large
Kilby Gibson	Resident Member at Large
Judith Hansen	Heritage Commission Representative
Joan Nesbitt	Resident Member at Large

Recording Secretary: Margot Keate West

City Staff: Sailen Black, Development Planner

AGENDA

Site Visit: 3537 Osler Street Applicant: Loy Leyland Architect

Business:

1. Minute Taking: Discussion
2. FSAD Panel Procedure Review - for new members
3. Review of the Minutes: Nov. 23, 2006, Jan. 11, 2007 and Feb. 1, 2007
4. Recent Project Update

Address: 1628 Marpole Avenue
Applicant: Donna Chomichuk, Landscape Architect
Description: Swimming pool, cabana and landscape work in the front of this pre-1940, VHR "B" listed property.
Enquiry: First (After recent enquiry concerning a fence line between properties)

Address: 3637 Pine Crescent
Applicant: Donna Chomichuk, Landscape Architect
Description: Metal fence and masonry wall around this pre-1940, VHR "A" listed property
Enquiry: First

Address: 1990 West 18th Avenue
Applicant: Howard Airey, Formwerks Homes Inc.
Description: Addition, alteration and complete renovation to this pre-1940's residence, including the landscaping.
Application: First Review - DE411116

Business**1. Minute Taking Discussion:**

Michelle McMaster suggested that the panel officially nominate Margot Keate West to continue as the recording secretary for the FSAD Panel. Seconded by Carole Walker-Angus; Carried unanimously.

2. Panel Procedure Review

- The positions of Chair and Vice-chair will be reviewed when there is quorum. Welcome to the new members: Clinton Cuddington, Elizabeth Whitelaw, Lori Kozub, Donna Aitken, Joan Nesbitt, Mamie Angus and Judith Hansen.
- Meetings begin with news, business, project updates, followed by project reviews. These reviews start with a presentation by the applicant, followed by Panel questions, planning comments, Panel comments and at the end, the applicant has the opportunity to address the Panel. The minutes of the meeting are sent to the applicant so that comments may be addressed before the next presentation.
- Abstentions from a vote are considered a vote in favour. Therefore abstentions are discouraged unless there is conflict of interest.
- Please feel free to ask for clarification when technical/architectural terms are used. The panel encourages discussion, as long as the applicant is present. Discussion of projects during the business portion of the meeting is strongly discouraged.
- Transparency and respect for the applicant is of utmost importance. Comments should be addressed towards the physical design proposed.
- If a Panel member has comments similar to those that have already been stated, please reiterate, rather than stay quiet. The minutes will reflect the comments that are emphasized the most.
- If you have a conflict of interest, please bring this to the attention of the Panel at the beginning of the meeting. If you suspect a possible conflict, please discuss this with the Panel prior to seeing the project. The safest route is to excuse yourself from this portion of the meeting.
- By offering design solutions you may be supplanting the architect who has been hired for this project. Please do not draw; make comments on the design before you instead. This is particularly important for Panel members who are registered design professionals.
- Please stick to the procedures outlined. Please try not to draw the applicant into a discussion at an inappropriate time (i.e. during Panel comments).
- The panel requested that planning provide comments/questions for each project at the beginning of the meeting. These would be even more helpful in written form.

3. Review of the Minutes

- Review of the Minutes of Nov. 23rd, 2006, Jan. 11th and Feb. 1st, 2007 was deferred until there is quorum.
- Clarification of the minutes of Feb. 1st, 2007: Michelle McMaster found that the minutes relating to the project at 1628 Marpole Ave. (2nd page) present a conflict, and do not reflect the consensus of the Panel. Under Comments: Two panel members expressed legitimate concern for the chain-link proposed, but the motion made was intended to express support for the design as presented (including chain-link). This appears to conflict with the wording of the motion. To the recollection of Panel members who had been present at the meeting, the Panel was generally okay with chain-link on the inside edge, and in combination with the hedge. This clarification will be conveyed to the applicants.
- It was decided that the Chair would try to identify majority consensus items and summarize them at the end of each presentation.

4. Recent Project Update: Upcoming projects include:

- **1186 Richelieu Avenue**-stairs up to the front entrance. In house, won't come before Panel because of scale of project.
- **1389 The Crescent** - Robert Lemon will be changing a cabana. Planning will address this as well
- **1438 Balfour Avenue** and **1589 Matthews Avenue** are proceeding through their DP processes. They will be returning as applications.
- **1990 W. 18th Avenue** - Permission has been granted to secure the property and begin exploratory interior work.

Site Visit: Address: 3537 Osler Street
Architect: Loy Leland, Architect

Proposal:

The owner purchased this property with the goal of demolition. The existing house has too small a footprint, doesn't have enough going for it to retain. Proposed house will have same orientation, same curb cuts, will be pushed back into the NW corner, with better landscaping. Traditional style house is proposed; to be brought to the Panel for consideration shortly.

Questions:

Has the panel been asked to comment on retention versus demolition of house in isolation from a proposed plan? Director of Planning has asked for FSAD Panel's comments on whether or not this house is meritorious.

- Square footage? 3000 sq. ft. roughly
- Allowable FSR? 10000 sq ft., site is 23200 sq. ft.
- Pool? No, water feature in back
- Garage? No subterranean parking, proposed house will have detached garage instead.
- History of house? Built as a smaller house, and noteworthy for that reason. Landscaping was once more dramatic than it is now. Other history is unknown
- Are there options other than demolition? No, owner bought it for demolition.

Planning Comments:

Would like to hear the Panel's comments on the merit of the house and whether it should be retained, with reference to the design quality in the FSD Guidelines and the estate-like quality of the area. As a site in excess of 23,000 square feet this property would qualify for infill, or the house could be expanded.

Panel Comments:

Estate like character is one where there is a sense of space around the house, rather than that the house is grand. The openness of that property in Shaughnessy is of value for that reason. Helps to create estate like feel for neighbouring houses. House should stay. Concur about openness. Scale is not as large as others, but it is nicely sited, and landscaping could be brought back. Attractive, nice detached garage. Very picturesque. FSD should not be a place of homogeneity. Eclecticism, styles of the time are important to the character of FSD. The things that make it different are the things that are most valuable. Prominent site, prominent corner. Surrounded by much larger houses. Looks weak in contrast. Looks out of place- given its position. House is charming. No great detailing merit but nice character to gable, leaded windows, conservatory structure. Not opposed to seeing house changed or demolition if it will be replaced with something better for this location. Site could use something better. Has gone down hill since it was originally built. Shed dormers aren't original. Could be replaced with something better. Sorry to see this house go. Better to see an infill. Looks like a liveable house. House has good connection to the landscape front and back. Charming house to live in. We're losing too many of these houses in Shaughnessy. Trying to preserve landscape in FSD and small footprint is important. Charming house, nice to see a renovation to keep as much character as possible. Houses are starting to look generic. Charm of neighbourhood is being lost as houses become more similar in scale, setback, style etc. Nice thing about streetscapes in FSD is variation of setbacks, sizes, styles. Meritorious. Represents a different style of house for FSD. Landscape is very prominent and makes the house. Retention of the house would be in keeping with the guidelines, and it has meritorious aspects.

Chair's Summary:

Landscaping and sense of space is pleasing, and in keeping with estate like character of FSD. House looks weak on site because of prominent placement and size in relation to new neighbouring houses. House is charming, and representative of original small scale houses that are being lost throughout FSD. One mention of infill. Several comments that replacement has to be better than what is there.

Panel Decision:

Is the house of merit, and would the Panel request be retained? 5 for, 3 against.

Address: 1628 Marpole Avenue
Applicant: Donna Chomichuk, Landscape Architect
Description: Swimming pool, cabana and landscape work in the front of this pre-1940, VHR "B" listed property.
Enquiry: First (After recent enquiry concerning a fence line between properties)

Summary:

This site has been before the Panel recently. The site is half of an HRA written 10 years ago. Heritage B Tudor house at top of site. Original landscape plan was for property to be retained as one large site. Landscaping plan was executed on 1628, but not 1638 Marpole Avenue. Fence was added by subsequent owner. Encumbrance was placed on the title due to this. This is being resolved with the city at the moment. The FSADP and VHC voted to remove the clause from the HRA that referred to the landscaping of this site. At the last FSADP meeting, a proposal was presented to replace fence with hedge and chain-link with planting on both sides. There was a consensus that while the chain-link was of concern, the intent of the motion was to support the proposal as presented.

Program:

New proposal is to add a pool and cabana at the front of the house.

Allowable FSR is 8,888 sq. ft. The pool will not technically be in the front yard, but within building setback.

Gentle terracing and flatter lawn near to house. Pool nestled below, with good sun exposure. Cabana is proposed because pool is a great distance from house both vertically and horizontally. The cabana will provide a Barbecue area, changing, powder room etc.

New set of stairs off of deck. Lawn is currently 8-10% slope. Will be re-graded at 2-3% slope, minimizing cut and fill. Proposing to remove metal fence along driveway. Remove chain-link at front of property and replace with 4 ft. vinyl coated metal fence.

Character of pool area - options presented with styles relating to heritage house. Design attempts to minimize presence of cabana from driveway. Has moved father west than shown in Panel's packages. This will allow for planting. Formal axial view across pool from cabana. Character to be in keeping with the older home.

Holly tree will be only tree removed. Lawn will be retained wherever possible for children to play. Groundcover will cascade over walls of driveway to reduce severity of concrete wall. Very well screened area from front/street. Moving east along Marpole Avenue there shouldn't be any views of cabana.

Location isn't ideal, but site situation dictates it, and site planning works well in this situation.

A context map showing pools in front yard of 4 others on this crest of the hill (within a block, and including neighbouring property to east) was presented.

Panel Questions:

- Mechanical equipment? Underneath cabana, within change room footprint.
- What's in cabana? Powder room and change room within cabana; barbecue area attached.
- Brown area? Countertop for outdoor kitchen.
- Fencing for pool? Property is fenced at perimeter.
- Views from neighbours? Only overlook is from the Master bedroom of 1638 Marpole Avenue. This has been considered.
- Why is hot tub at deck instead of at pool? This has been considered, but fitting it in at pool level was difficult, and owners might use it more if it's convenient to house. Overviews in this location are not a problem
- Square footage of cabana? 6.5 ft x8 ft. change room, over all 10 ft. x 17 ft.
- Curving wall? 1 ft Retaining wall, also acts as seat wall.
- Further fortification through planting? Hedge closest to Marpole Avenue is in good condition. Second is not in good shape. Would like to remove this second hedge; cedar isn't appropriate for this shady location. A woodland shade garden is proposed for behind hedge where current lawn has not done well, and it's overgrown.
- Existing 12 ft. cedar hedge towards back? Staying - provides privacy from neighbour
- Privacy for hot tub on deck? Unlikely to see anything as house is set so high.

Planning Questions:

Planning recognizes the challenge of fitting pool into sloping site. Existing flat area at back was discussed internally as an alternate location. Looking for comments on the design proposed, including location, size, cabana, and landscaping.

Panel Comments:

As long as cabana is discrete it will be great: Add value to property. Nice addition. Will look like it was meant to be there. Liked comment about getting rid of varied materials and unifying look. This helps. No use to put the pool behind house beside garage. Much nicer as proposed. Works with style of main house. Stairs coming down from main terrace with lawn for croquet and pool beyond. Like terracing. Nice job of tucking things into landscape without making a big show of swimming pool. Shade/woodland garden protects street and homeowner. Really nice job. Pool at back wouldn't be as successful. Concern about a certain level of privacy. This type of siting, with pool in front is difficult: Contrary to guidelines to present fortification to street. Presents possibility of dark spot on your walk through FSD. Interested to see shadow casting. As much sun there as anywhere else on site. Pool at back presents problems. Cabana could be bigger and include shower. Option C with gable ended cabana to match house is best. Support design: ideal place for pool and nice design. Lament that HRA didn't go through but plan is good. Wouldn't have been as nice to see other option. Concerned that cabana should not be prominent from street but seems to be being addressed.

Chair's Summary:

Happy with landscaping, an improvement, liked materials. Cabana shouldn't be prominent, but could be bigger for use reasons. Consensus that front yard position was favourable, not the back yard position option presented by City.

Panel Decision:

To support this proposal to add a swimming pool, cabana and landscape work in front of 1628 Marpole Avenue: All in favour.

Applicant's Response:

Can't put pool in hammerhead of driveway. Outdoor shower is planned. Don't want this to be too imposing on landscape, trying to keep scale small.

Address: 3637 Pine Crescent
Applicant: Donna Chomichuk, Landscape Architect
Description: Metal fence and masonry wall around this pre-1940, VHR "A" listed property
Enquiry: First

Program:

Two phases: Plans to improve site, currently have a contractor engaged doing stonework; fence is being proposed as a separate application from the planting/landscaping.

Existing heritage "A" came before FSAD Panel 10 years ago for minor renovation. Nice mature copper beech and a large Japanese umbrella pine at corner. Beautiful mature hedge 5 ft. 6 in. tall. Not much landscaping done over last few years. Pedestrian gate is at corner. Georgian, formal yet simple. Fits in with FSD guidelines. 6 ft. wood fence along Hosmer St. side. Fence is in poor shape, falling over. Back lane granite wall from 12 in. to 6 ft. high with wood fence on top. Fence on top will be replaced with 6ft. metal picket fence, and on Pine Crescent and Hosmer Avenue sides, a low 2 ft. granite base and 4 ft. of metal work above. Notable gateposts. Examples taken from FSD: this is a typical proportion and height. Asking for a relaxation in front fence height. Want something that fits in and complements house but owners need security for site.

Panel Questions:

- Metal fence attached to top of stone? Yes.
- Support? Decorative brackets to support intermediate posts will be attached at back. Angle brackets like this found on fences along the Crescent.
- Hedge that is currently there will be removed? Yes, for construction, but it will be replaced. Will be shown as part of planting plan for next phase.
- Fence on Pine Crescent side? Hedge removed as well? Yes.
- Cap on granite fence? Granite as well.
- Total height proposed? 6 ft.
- Granite will be matched? If possible. Matched in terms of patterning, colouring if possible. Irish pointing won't be replicated, as it doesn't last well.
- Design? Owners would prefer more stone and less metal. Preference would be for 30 in. stone, but pool enclosure requires 4 ft. of fence above, so this would make the overall height 6 ft. 6 in.

Planning Comments:

Some concerns about loss of view into property due to 7 ft. hedge behind fence but impressed by the design quality in general. Looking for comments on the design proposed.

Panel Comments:

Happy with proposal and materials. In keeping with house. Looks good. Happy with height. If it's done in stages it would be nice if it's soon. Nice detail to house. Will finish it off. Congratulate the owner in giving this to community. Reinforces FSD character. Corner gate is key, and these elements are being lost all over FSD: nice to see this one retained and emphasized. Low stone wall and ironwork are good. Like to see you revisit gates to really classic Georgian style. Nice project. If there is a classic Georgian gate it would be worth considering. Ties in elegantly with house. Commendable. Okay to contribute to character of neighbourhood rather than replicate what already exists. Designer should be allowed to put their own stamp on it (in reference to gate design). Fortification aspect of perimeter fence is hard to deal with - would be nice to see fence pushed back to sides of house. Glad that the pattern of the separate corner pedestrian gate is being retained. Mailbox may be too high as shown. Commend Designer for checking conditions of walls in FSD and on property. Support proportions and height of fence. Stepping wall for grade reasons would be a shame. Would be nice to keep clean line at working drawings stage. There is an opportunity to reference main entrance of house with an opening for views through hedge. Filigree isn't present but would be a good goal. Delighted to see fence proposed. Support concept. Not sure about curlicues on car gate. Pedestrian gate has slightly oriental feel.

Chair's Summary:

In favour of granite, wrought iron and height. Vegetation behind will be important, and needs to be done soon.

Panel Decision:

To support metal fence and masonry wall around 3637 Pine Crescent and height relaxation at front: All in favour.

Address: 1990 West 18th Avenue
 Applicant: Howard Airey, Formwerks Homes Inc.
 Landscape Architect: Paul Sangha
 Description: Addition, alteration and complete renovation to this pre-1940's residence, including the landscaping.
 Application: First Review - DE411116

Program:

Not much change since November enquiry. Parking in back was going to count against FSR. Explored plan to move original house, add driveway and put parking beneath. As a result of this, Planning offered to consider relaxation of FSR for a detached garage from lane or the side street to better retain landscape if house stays in place with no ramp carved into landscape. Neighbours have had cars broken into so a second small garage (third spot) is being proposed for rear corner where parking pad exists.

Architecture:

Will be architect's own house. Currently derelict, but with good bones. Plan is to strip it back, keep structure of house and add a 2-storey library addition on interior side yard. Two car garage on southwest corner with non-habitable space above; 1 car garage on SE corner. House wasn't designed for corner. Plans are to animate Maple Street façade by carving back loggia, bumping out bays. Stone currently on foundation wall; toying with idea of bringing granite up to mid level. Not sure about this treatment. Replace all windows and roofing. Replicate woodwork details for additions. Keep bargeboards where possible, replicate elsewhere. Not a very deep rear yard - creates nice outdoor room by bracketing with small garages. Feel will be more like garden cottages, rather than parking garages.

Landscape:

The benefit of not having sunken parking is that layered looser planting that is typical for FSD can be kept. Garage animates the street when oriented toward Maple Street. Tucking pool to one edge with evergreen magnolias planted along lane. Few conifers worth trying to save. Hoping to start with clean planting slate, as most trees have been topped and aren't in good shape.

Panel Questions:

- Setback between lane and garage? Might be close; up to Engineering.
- Dotted lines on east elevation? Reflected windows of neighbouring house.
- A07 - bottom of crawlspaces? Have to be concrete
- Garage doors? Changed to one large door with vertical panels - not as busy.
- Internal width of garage? 19-20 ft.
- Impermeable area? Will calculate for next time. Probably less, as driveway isn't there. Gravel paths.
- Hot tub? At end of covered porch - granite walls. Raised 18 in., tucked in as part of stairs.
- Granite wall will be on three sides of property? Not on back- grade changes, disappears into nothing. Will return it a little bit.
- Wrought iron fence? Possibly returned up lane to end of garage.
- Trees staying? Multi-stem beside garage on property line/lane? Anticipate that this will come down. Retained trees are all in front: Applicant will provide arbourist's report.
- Two car garage - was there room to bring it off lane? Slope is difficult; orienting it toward Maple Street makes it look more like coach house.
- Space above garage? Not habitable. Helps with scale
- Details of loggia etc.? Lifted from house of same period that owner has on Pender Street (but originally from Vancouver). Recessed loggia in combination with bays makes for interest - undulating façade.
- Dropped ridgeline over library? Differentiates old from new, breaks up what would be a very long ridge.

Planning Comments:

Looking for comments on the architectural and landscape design proposed. Does the Panel support the relaxation of FSR for the southwest garage, or a further relaxation for third car space?

Panel Comments:

The Panel noted that when there are revisions of this extent from what was provided in the packages, it would be appreciated if 11" x 17"s are provided for circulation.

Happy that house is being kept. Sows ear turning into a silk purse. Support two small garages. Adds interest and encloses space nicely. Keeping front green and open and natural is in keeping with FSD character. Great project. Like idea of two separate garages. Much better than driveway and buried parking. Scale fits nicely. Retaining siting is good. Staying with wood shingles on base is good. Right move over massively moving/ripping into house. Support relaxation. Backside is congested - threading the needle. Maybe consider switching two car for one in terms of siting. Seems out of scale. Support relaxation. Ridgeline bothers - true division of addition would be better done if roof plane was pulled back. Leave stone foundation with shingles above. Tying garage with stone component helps to stitch together - makes garage feel like continuation of fence. Transformation to this building is amazing. Commendable. Single car garage feels like natural site for garage. Two car garage is better not coming off of lane. Maybe switching locations of garages, it might fit better. Pull pool towards Maple Street. Existing house has substantial columns. Roof over new rear porch is not as successful (east and south elevation). Support relaxation. Nice to see detached garages. New garage doors are great. Like option with less granite. Prefer landscape with less hard surface (presented at meeting). Interested in seeing garage sizes swapped. Happy to see house fixed up. Totally happy with relaxations. Underground garages are not desirable. Happy to see City do this for other applicants, too. Design and siting of house is great. Less granite is better. Understand why garage comes off of street. Garage is best in same materials as house: granite base shingles above. Back yard feels crowded. Support relaxations. Support for two car garage, but not third. Does good things for street. Separate doors are more of the era. Third garage means that back garden needs more space. Hot tub is a modern response: a place for this should be found where garage is. Back yard needs to be pushed to east property line to work properly. East elevation - proportion of windows doesn't feel quite right (drawings of March 15). Needs to be more elegant. Roofline is fine. Landscape plan presented March 15, 2007 is much better than the one included in the Panel packages.

Chair's Summary:

In favour of FSR relaxation, with one comment about one less garage. In favour of architecture and landscape, with comment that back is crowded. Members commented on switching garages. Ridgeline at front was mentioned. Roofline of back porch and moving the hot tub were also mentioned

Panel Decision:

To support, with reference to the drawings presented today with comments addressed: 7 in favour, 1 against.

That applicant returns for a second review: Moved by Judy Ross, 3 in favour, 5 against.

Applicant's Response:

Idea of switching locations of garages was considered, and 2 car garage in other location adversely affected back covered porch area and view from library. Twenty-eight ft. side yard and 15 ft. side yard, seem to fit 2 car and 1 car. (Several panel members agreed and retracted their comments about switching locations of garages).

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm