

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

Minutes of the Meeting of May 24, 2007

QUORUM

Present:	Beth Noble, Chair Kathy Reichert, Vice-Chair Kilby Gibson Joan Nesbitt Carole Walker Angus Donna Aitken Lori Kuzub Michelle McMaster Elisabeth Whitelaw Clinton Cuddington Judith Hansen	Resident - SHPOA Member Resident Member at Large Resident Member at Large Resident Member at Large Resident - SHPOA Member Resident - SHPOA Member Resident - SHPOA Member BCSLA BCSLA AIBC Heritage Commission Representative
Regrets/Absences:	Mamie Angus* Derek Neale Judy Ross	Resident Member at Large AIBC Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver * Leave of absence granted
Recording Secretary:	Margot Keate West	
City Staff:	Sailen Black, Development Planner, UDDPC	

AGENDA

Site Visit:	
4:00	<p>Address: 1056 Matthews Avenue Enquirer: Loy Leyland Architect Inc. Description: To consider the architectural and heritage merit of this pre-1940 house, on a site proposed for subdivision with demolition as a consequence. Enquiry: First</p>
5:00	<p>Business: 1. Review of the Minutes of April 5, 2007 2. Recent Projects Update</p>
5:15	<p>Address: 3537 Osler Street Applicant: Loy Leyland Architect Inc. Description: To consider the proposed design of new single-family house and garage. An enquiry was made to the FSAD Panel regarding the merit of the existing house on March 15, 2007. A study prepared by the architect of retention options is included. Application: First Review - DE411343</p>
6:00	<p>Address: 3885 Selkirk Street Applicant: Loy Leyland Architect Inc. Description: To consider the proposed design of new single-family house with parking below. Enquiry: First</p>

Business:

1. Review of the Minutes of April 5, 2007.

Motion: Moved to accept minutes as presented: Moved: Michelle McMaster. Carried unanimously

2. Recent Projects Update:

Upcoming projects include:

- **3637 Pine Crescent** - landscaping
- **1056 Matthews Avenue.** - general enquiry re: subdivision and demolition
- **1178 Laurier Avenue** - redoing the back yard, no alterations to house. Scope of work is limited, and won't be seen by the panel
- **1402 (1420) McRae** - review at the next meeting followed by meeting at Hycroft, June 14. *The Urban Design panel the application on June.*
- Enquiries of a speculative nature should generally be directed to the ODP or call the enquiry centre prior to calling the Development Planner.

3. Discussion of site visit, 1056 Matthews Avenue:

The owner didn't know that the FSAD Panel was coming to site visit. In this case, the architect was representing a prospective owner (rather than the actual owner, as the city assumed). This visit was at the request of the Director of Planning, as an application for subdivision is being considered for this site. Subdivision requires the demolition of the house, as it straddles the proposed lot line.

If the Panel chooses to not do cold visits when it is not the owner who is seeking them, the Panel may find that they have a reduced ability to influence the decisions made by the Director of Planning in these cases. Throughout the city, non-owners can apply for a development permit without notifying the current owner.

In this case, the site visit should have been better arranged. Sidewalk only visits are fine.

Note: This topic to the agenda for the next meeting for further discussion.

4. Landscaping and fencing of a property - 3637 Pine Crescent:

Neighbours of this property received notification of the application and a request for comments. The owners of this property had already begun work without permit. When a neighbour called the city, they were told that they had to make a complaint to the city inspector. This cannot be done anonymously - the city inspector requires a name associated with these calls. The Panel feels that this undermines the whole system, as neighbours are inclined to feel that their input is of no consequence or value if it is apparent that the city is not policing these applications. The process needs to be better integrated as there is evidently a gap. Judith Hansen will write a letter to the director of planning regarding this.

Site Visit:Address: **1056 Matthews Avenue**

Enquirer: Loy Leyland Architect Inc.

Description: To consider the architectural and heritage merit of this pre-1940 house, on a site proposed for subdivision with demolition as a consequence.

Enquiry: First

Proposal: To demolish a pre-1940 house in order to subdivide property. Intention is to demolish and seek subdivision of the property. The developer has no interest in retaining it, moving it or anything of that nature. They feel that house is not practical to retain, and without architectural merit. It is possible to restore, but not practical. It has been a rooming house since the 1940's. Not in original condition. Seven immediate neighbours are in support of demolition

Questions:

- Are neighbours in support of demolition of a rooming house, or of this building? Both
- Structural integrity? No engineer involved, just assuming that it is too old to be sound.
- Garage has merit. Is there a possibility that this could be retained? No. not worth retaining.
- Lot size? 29,000 sq. ft. Two properties created would be larger than average.
- Garden- Monkey puzzle tree and rhododendrons? On perimeter of building envelope, likely could stay.
- Non conforming building? Rear yard setback is non-conforming.
- Is 1083 Matthews in support of demolition? No letter of support from that owner
- Square footage of existing house? Don't know
- Age of house? Around 1912
- Have you been in the house? No
- Why no inspection? No interest in retention.

Planning Comments:

The Director of Planning is seeking your comments on the architectural and landscape merit of this property.

Panel Comments

This feels a bit rushed, without knowing more about interior and integrity of home. Quality of home may be negatively impacted by current use. Needs a thorough evaluation. Some Panel members don't think it's worth retaining as it has been altered, and is strangely sited on lot. Others felt that this would be a significant loss for the neighbourhood. Beautiful home underneath that deserves to be restored. To preserve and protect pre-1940s houses and landscapes is the Panel's raison d'etre. Constricted by how this arrived at this table, but retention should be explored. Feel restricted in what can be said. Want to know more, and don't want to write it off until then. Subdivision is contrary to why ODP was written. In subdividing we will lose the grandeur of original property. Bones of the house are still there, and have merit.

More in depth analysis of the house is required. Varying lot sizes are part of FSD streetscape. Carving up lots is not helpful in this regard - makes it more uniform. Needs more review, large mass, on a large lot. Here is a larger house that would suit buyers who want a large house. Too early to give a recommendation for demolition. Looks like there is potential for retention. Landscape - significant trees are at perimeter and that's a good thing. Tragedy to lose another pre-1940 house. If one had the will, it could be restored magnificently. Low ranchers on either side don't have same kind of architectural merit. The panel just saw an application for a house in far worse shape, that is going to be restored - this one is not too far gone. Shame to lose the garden. Garage is stunning and if it is any indication what house is like underneath, it should be retained and restored.

Architect's Response:

Is not retainable in its current position and state. Regrettable, but this is how it is. Conclusion will remain that demolition is inevitable.

Address: 3537 Osler Street
 Applicant: Loy Leyland Architect Inc.
 Description: To consider the proposed design of new single-family house and garage. An enquiry was made to the FSAD Panel regarding the merit of the existing house on March 15, 2007. A study prepared by the architect of retention options is included.
 Application: First Review – DE411343

Proposal: To discuss options for this house, including demolition of pre - 1940 house. Retention proposals tend to dwarf existing house. Documentation has been provided as regards retention options. The applicant has chosen not to pursue these options.

Architecture: Driveway crossings are retained. Garage is in back corner and is in a better position. Three parking spaces within house, and two in detached garage. House is inspired by shingle style, and composite of other Shaughnessy -like styles. Tudoresque influences in gables. Skirting goes around with open porte cochere in front. Indigenous materials. Roof comes down to main floor. Granite first floor. Romantic and eclectic.

Landscaping: Open corner and feel of original landscape are retained. Expresses vernacular of Shaughnessy. Responds to character of neighbourhood. Keep framework around edge of site. Substantial amount of plant material will remain. Enhanced space where house comes closest to Matthews. Reuse as much original planting as possible. Improve the hiding of automobiles. Formal frontage. Layering and filigree - surprise views of house. Gazebo in side yard at front. Wall lowered at corner to improve traffic safety and views across.

Panel Questions:

- Landscaping at front? Yew hedge (5 ft.) behind the wall. Tree at south driveway entry, and at north driveway entry (Magnolia) are being retained. No other trees. Blue spruce in middle of lawn is staying.
- Driveway shape? Cuts are retained; shape is dictated by building envelope.
- Driveway paving, patio etc? Roman pavers, not stamped concrete.
- Permeable? No not technically; they will be set in sand.
- Space underneath garage? Not excavated
- FSR? Maximum at 10,500 sq. ft. including detached garage.
- Under height? At 35 ft. except for two architectural appurtenances.
- Percent of impervious area? Under allowable, not yet calculated
- Inspired by other Shaughnessy houses? No, inspired by other houses elsewhere, but similar to other houses constructed by this architect.
- Relaxations? No
- Roof material? Zinc on features (turret and tower)
- Tripartite? Roof, shingles, granite base.
- Lattice at gable ends? Seemed like a nice light feature.
- Had larger trees or shrubs been considered for front? Hasn't been ruled out.
- Is there a requirement for presenting architect to sign off at the end of construction? No. building inspector will call if there's something needing attention.
- Other house on Osler Street not built according to approved plan? Framers made a mistake on the porte cochere but it was rectified.

Planning Comments: Planning is seeking Panel comments on the architectural and landscape design proposed, including the openness of the Matthews and Osler corner; the layering and filigree provided to screen the main floor of the house as seen from Osler; the degree of tree retention; and the shape and prominence of the turret on the corner.

Panel Comments: Value houses that are existing. Hard to evaluate merits of this plan when we don't support demolition of existing house. Follows guidelines, but lacks integrity of house that is there now. Shame that buyers are guided into buying houses of merit with the intention of demolition. This type of house (existing) is why people want to buy into FSD. Although the proposed house conforms to guidelines,

it will not add to merit of future Shaughnessy. Can't see people getting on buses to tour these new houses. Not a positive move.

Looks large, especially front turret. Massive. Landscape could help house to settle into lot better. Higher trees and shrubs might soften look of house. Openness of corner is nice, but the house needs to be screened somehow. Too massive to leave without. Trees within circular driveway would help. House feels super-sized for property. In-your-face, not restrained elegance. Needs to be toned down. Needs to look more like typical Shaughnessy homes rather than a fabrication of a variety of different styles. This is not an improvement on the existing house.

Façade is overwhelming. So much happening, so busy, so big; Not gracious. Five car garage seems excessive. Siting could be better, not so close to street. Coverage of lot seems excessive. Support all that's been said. Seems to be as big and prominent as possible. Doesn't seem to fit with the reason while we're here. It may not be practical, but it's the way it is. Disappointed in demo of existing house. Architecture of old house is more in keeping with the neighbourhood. Proposed house is ostentatious. No landscape to balance house.

It is the owner's right to ask for a house of this size. Retaining what was interesting about the old house is not going to be right for this house. Landscaping should suit the proposed house rather than attempt to recreate what is good about the current situation.

If front landscape was treated with more density/ robustness it would screen view of house better. Not a fortified site; will help connectedness of neighbourhood. Roof treatment is good, as it helps to diminish mass.

Old house is grander than led to believe. Lack of landscape makes new house feel obtrusive on street. Use of granite is excessive - Makes house feel even more massive than it has to be. Lattice in gable end is excessive. Five cars seem excessive. Overall colours don't do anything for the house.

Landscape has done what is there already, but that's not a great solution with this house. Pond/bridge feels unsafe. Cutback at corner is a nice detail.

Turret could be smaller and needs to protrude above roofline to be properly proportioned. Nice that gazebo echoes shape.

Pastiche of too many diverse elements. Doesn't hold together stylistically. Shingle styles houses usually only have one turret, and it's higher than bulk of roof. This is not the same animal - for one, the primary material is granite not shingles. Detracts from overall. Vaulted areas bulk up house, which increases the mass. Large for the site. Lacks an integrity given by one style. Too close to street. Feels cramped.

Presence would be increased by moving back. More layering in landscape would improve it

Appreciate work that's gone into this. Too many styles. Shingle style - with not very many shingles. Cape Cod, French, baronial. Needs to be pushed in one direction. Too much stone. Lattice in gable isn't necessary, it detracts. Turret would be better up above roofline (ridge). Fireplace in big turret looks very out of place. Grace of shape is lost - interruption with chimney and bulls eye windows ruins it. Really huge in it's overall massing. Relationship to the street is too tight. Doesn't feel grand because there isn't enough space. Front door needs more emphasis. Landscape - gazebo is too busy, low wood fence would be much better than granite wall. Explore foundation planting. Openness of corner isn't there anymore.

Architect's Response:

Zoning encourages more cars within house. 15' setback is at front of porte-cochere. Turret is always contentious. Considered alternate locations for master bedroom fireplace. Within setbacks. Would be nice to have a higher turret, but height restrictions don't allow this. Will consider amount of stone.

Owner Comments:

Working within city's parameters. City dictates setbacks and building envelope. Size of house relates to what is allowed by the city.

Motion: To see this again with comments addressed. Moved: Beth Noble; seconded Michelle McMaster. Carried 10 for, 1 against.

Address: **3885 Selkirk Street**
 Applicant: Loy Leyland Architect Inc.
 Description: To consider the proposed design of new single-family house with parking below.
 Enquiry: First
 Client: Ms. Virani

Proposal: To demolish a post 1940's house and replace with a single family house. Corner site. Staying with pattern of development there. Parking is under the house. Ramp down north side. Retaining wall with planting along property line. Not of any particular style - neo classical, Georgian. Slate roof, stucco walls and detailing. Wood windows, curved divided lights are sort of Italianate. Two storey stucco pilasters. Hipped roof. No relaxations required. Landscape concept presented.

Panel Questions:

- Impermeable surface calculation yet? No, but will have to comply.
- Lawn for a retention tank? Probably in front , or underneath driveway.
- Drop in elevation for driveway? 7.5 - 8 ft.
- East elevation front; wooden panel treatment ? Applied to wall.
- Window detail on east elevation? Leaded glass.
- Rhododendrons will be kept? Don't know yet
- Two small Japanese maples could be easily retained. Would you consider? Yes
- Stairs to BBQ patio? Four foot rise.
- Addressing layering/filigree? Will do that for next time, with more complete package
- West elevation, right side balustrade? Yes for open balcony.
- South elevation? No windows on second floor
- Space on west back wall and property line? 35 ft. (rear yard setback)
- Who benefits from the water feature - from what viewpoint? Family room, has to do with garage placement.
- Fenestration patterns are mystifying? Large semi-circular window on living room with barrel vaulted ceiling behind.
- Large picture window - huge sheets of glass? 10 ft. x 6 ft. and 10 ft. x 8 ft.
- Where is style coming from? Is this something that the guidelines are dictating, or is this architect's wish? A mix.

Planning Comments: With the preface that staff could not identify the style proposed and welcome Panel input on that point, the Director of Planning is seeking your comments on the architectural and landscape design proposed, including the sunken driveway and ramp leading to it; the stylistic choices made; and tree retention along the west property line.

Panel Comments:

Sunken driveway is right approach for this lot. Stylistically, it's okay to lend your own style if this is your intention. House suffers from such a strong slate roof, strong windows, and then stucco will feel weak. More stone would help in this case. Elegant. Large barrel vaulted window is balanced by repeated shape on other side. Retain trees where possible. Sunken driveway seems like necessity on this site. Leaded windows are a nice idea. Sunken driveway is okay. Man gate would help pedestrian access. House on Matthews with vaulted living room has a more successful treatment for windows. Don't like ramps, but it would reduce the size of house to do a freestanding garage. Bring ramp away from north property line. Retain as many trees as possible. Emphasize base. Italianate style seems to fit best. Big arched window is not in character with rest of style. Window detail needs to continue the same way. Smooth cut stone base. Pedestrian access needs to be addressed. Like form of house in relation to size of lot. Elegance in massing and roofline. Sits nicely on property. Ramp is a workable solution. Tree retention is desirable. Magnolia could be repositioned. Planting looks too fussy for house. Paving needs to be reduced. Banding at bottom of house would help. In support of demolishing existing house. Massing is too symmetrical and balanced for the window style. Less impermeable area. Sunken driveway and ramp are difficult. Consider coming in from Laurier side. Planting under trees on west side would be a challenge.

Like symmetry of front entrance trees- stately, handsome, leaded windows, water features, roof material. Concerned about hard-scape. One whole half is paved, balance is off. View from street needs work- no sense of welcome or entry. Façade is visually confusing. Too many different windows for simplicity of house form. Like balance between house and property. Feels manageable. Elegant, clean form, uneasy about windows across front. Need to conform with each other, or be simpler.

Doors flanking fireplace won't get used, because of proximity of Laurier. Also a security issue. Patio adjacent to basement stairs.

Sits well on property. Slate roof with stucco doesn't sit well. Georgian style windows would help. Nanny's room window could be bigger.

Chair's Summary:

Form is good. Style could use a bit of simplifying. Fenestration is of concern. Tree retention is good, style is approvable,

Motion : To see it as an application. Moved: Beth Noble. Carried unanimously.