

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

Minutes of the Meeting of July 19, 2007

NO QUORUM

Present:

Joan Nesbitt	Resident Member at Large
Mamie Angus	Resident Member at Large
Carole Walker Angus	Resident - SHPOA Member
Lori Kozub	Resident - SHPOA Member
Michelle McMaster	BCSLA
Elisabeth Whitelaw	BCSLA
Derek Neale	AIBC
Judy Ross	Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver

Regrets/Absences:

Beth Noble, Chair	Resident - SHPOA Member*
Kathy Reichert, Vice-Chair	Resident Member at Large*
Kilby Gibson	Resident Member at Large *
Donna Aitken	Resident - SHPOA Member*
Clinton Cuddington	AIBC*
Judith Hansen	Heritage Commission Representative*

(* Leave of Absence granted)

Recording Secretary: Margot Keate West

City Staff: Dale Morgan, Development Planner, UDDPC

AGENDA

Business:

1. Review of the Minutes of June 7, 2007
2. Projects Update

Address: 3537 Osler St
Applicant: Loy Leyland Architect
Description: To consider the proposed design of new single-family house and garage, replacing the pre-1940 house on the site
Application: Second Review - DE411343

Address: 1947 West King Edward Avenue
Applicant: Paolo Salvador, Inline Design
Description: To consider the proposed design of new single-family house and garage, replacing an existing house not listed on the Heritage Inventory.
Inquiry: First

Postponed:

Address: **1402 McRae Avenue**

Applicant: Formwerks Architectural Inc.

Description: Alterations and additions to the existing pre-1940 Heritage "A" listed house at 1402 McRae Avenue under development permit DE411348, to remain in place and be designated in accordance with a Heritage Agreement; and a rezoning application to permit 16 townhouse units on the vacant lots to the north west.

Application: Second (previously seen on June 7, 2007)

I. Business

1. **Minutes of June 7, 2007** were to be reviewed.
Motion deferred until next meeting due to lack of quorum.
2. **Projects Update:** No projects for discussion

Address: 3537 Osler St
Applicant: Loy Leyland Architect
Description: To consider the proposed design of new single-family house and garage, replacing the pre-1940 house on the site
Application: Second Review - DE411343

Changes to Architecture:

Fenestration has been simplified and made more consistent. Latticework has been removed from gables. Granite has been reduced - more shingles with granite pilasters. Central element has been toned down. Dome roof has been bellcast, and will be cedar rather than zinc. Windows have been squared up and brackets added.

Changes to Landscape:

Osler frontage: more plant material added. Two new trees, large ornamental grasses near entry. Matthews streetscape: much being retained of existing. Edging supplemented with other material. Existing street trees provide screening from across street. Gazebo has not been changed.

Panel Questions:

- Percentage of hardscape vs. soft? No numbers, but it is conforming
- Wall detail as indicated? Yes, granite with metal above. Piers will be different pattern than shown.
- Plant material under roof overhang? Yes.
- What will you do in winter? No irrigation in winter- will have to reconsider planting scheme.
- Colour scheme? Yellow singles with blue trim.
- Materials? Cedar shingles, zinc on back dome/turret, granite base
- Has building been scaled down? No. tower is slightly smaller
- FSR? Slightly less square footage above grade than fsr allows
- Stone detail on gate and fence? Why different? For emphasis
- Pattern of granite on house? Wall of house will be same pattern as fence wall (random)
- Tripartite expression? Rock base, shingles above with large roof plane
- Colour scheme? Cheerful, owner's choice.
- Height? 35 at ridge line, with 4' for cupola (architectural appurtenance)
- Letters of support? 18 of 25 closest neighbours have responded in support

Planning Comments: None

Panel Comments:

Redesign is an improvement. Thank you for considering comments. Reduction in granite is good. Change of fenestration is better. Colours are not right for style of house. Landscape has been adequately addressed. Cedar shingles on wall and roof are good improvement. Colours aren't great. Thought and work has gone into new design, but particular piece of property is iconic and this will change the entire feel of the area. Certain items in design guidelines aren't satisfied. Believe that this sort of house is key to the heritage of the neighbourhood - this type of proposal should go to the VHC for consideration. Support retention of original house.

Respect owners love of building homes, but this demo is detrimental to the neighbourhood. New home could be anywhere - has no relation to the heritage of FSD. New house doesn't meet standards. The house that is coming down has architectural and heritage merit; what goes up should be glorious

- this isn't it. No purity of style. Worked to maximum of what city will allow. Don't think this is positive for the neighbourhood. This is a loss for Shaughnessy. Better than first version. Still too large, still too close to Osler. Having problems with the scale issue. Tower is minor concession to larger problem. Uncomfortable. Addition of plant material tries to create sense of distance between house and street - not enough yet. Less granite is better. Cedar roof is better than zinc. Squaring up of windows is better. Chimney is still disturbing - still don't like it. Landscaping - expanse of lawn on original property has been lost - now property is enclosed/fortified. Mannerist style of architecture.

Recreation room in basement seems very sunken - down in a tunnel. Gazebo feels wrong on public side of property. Wall around property is an improvement. Window detail over front door/back door isn't working with rest of fenestration.

Concept of heritage / principle of heritage is being ignored. East side of FSD is particularly bad. Generally speaking there is little respect for existing architecture. Client driven work seems to result in showy houses that overshadow the traditional architecture in Shaughnessy - houses need to be toned down & subtle in order to achieve the elegance of the older houses. This house is too massive for the site, too close to the street. Colour choice will aggravate the problem.

Houses on sidewalk have to have some subtlety. Colours are Mediterranean, not appropriate for a rainforest. Body of house has to be grounded, sink into the ground. There needs to be more Respect shown for small property, subtlety, elegance, quiet.

No vote taken as there was no quorum.

Address: 1947 West King Edward Avenue
Applicant: Paolo Salvador, Inline Design
Description: To consider the proposed design of new single-family house and garage, replacing an existing house not listed on the Heritage Inventory.
Inquiry: First

Proposal:

To demolish post 1940's house and construct new house. Property is at a point on block that is level. Entrance will be retained at west side of property. Proposal is to build an English arts and crafts style house with tapered buttresses, bay window .

Post and beam trellis at back of house. Two storeys with partial basement and small attic. Cedar hedge will be removed and replaced. Low stone wall fence with wrought iron fence above. Arbourist report has just been received. Some existing trees that had been proposed for retention have to be removed because of health.

Formal look in entry, with significant entry point off street. Perimeter fence along lane will be added.

Panel Questions:

- Paving material in back yard? Interlocking universal concrete paver.
- Garage set back from laneway? Creates buffer, setback from east property line for potting area/ landscaping access to yard.
- Arbourist report? Just received. Many of the trees on the property have been badly neglected.
- Ratio of hard surface? Around 60% permeable, 40% impermeable (roughly)
- Could permeability be increased? Intending to spec permeable pavers on sand
- Trees on either side of front entrance? Small specimen trees, deciduous.
- Stairs to lower basement seem dark and a likely water problem? Placement is because of access to pool.
- Neighbouring house faces side of this house. Has this been taken in to consideration?
- Location of pool on this side as well - machinery? Equipment will be near garage. Screening will be evergreen.
- How does the finished floor elevation relate to present house? A bit higher - about 2'
- Pavers? Hoping to have permeability - on sand
- Landscape design seems generated mostly from the form of the house. Spaces left over.
Use/character of different areas? Front has formal function as entry way with small lawn mostly for visual. Rear yard is functional flex space.
- Pavers seem like a sea of hard surface. Large parties/family use for yard? Family oriented.
- Intent of grass pave area by lane? Access to landscape - maintenance.
- What trees are going to remain? Any? Austrian Pine is staying. All others are in poor condition.
- Back yard doesn't feel like Shaughnessy. More structure needed, less paving. Can something be done? Yes.
- Next visit could you bring paver sample? Yes.

Planning Comments:

Building is well sited, nice to see garage at lane. Planning would like to hear panel comments regarding landscaping/ hard surface. Entry location from sidewalk doesn't reinforce. Either more symmetrical or more a-symmetrical. Side elevations seem blank, chimney is too dominant. Stonework feels spotty, tapered pilasters feel too fine.

Panel Comments:

Appreciate your dedication to doing something nice with this piece of property. Like style of house, simplicity is good. Could be stronger if tapered columns were bolder/stronger. One side needs to be emphasised, or it should be more symmetrical - one or the other. Chimney needs work. Trellis idea in back is worth looking at. Need a program for whole space in back. Colour could be supplemented with punchy contrast colour. Would be helpful to have grade elevations on drawing. English arts and crafts could be great, but needs to be pushed further. Strong relationship between plan of house and garden is what is best about arts and crafts architecture. Plan is confused. Needs to respond to site and grade better. Fenestration on rear elevation is all over the place. English arts and crafts needs to be extended out into the garden.

Landscape could be improved if sections are done - very big. Need more form. Needs defined spaces - this will complement house. Rear garden - paving is overwhelming. Not enough soft material. Combine uses. Garden needs to be a shape - too amorphous. Pool doesn't reflect this type/style of architecture. Entry is nice offset, but it needs to be stronger. Whole entry gate could be pushed back from property line. Hard surface needs to be reduced. Pool is too close to west property line - 4 feet more would be better. Cedar hedge is not going to be soft enough, and won't provide enough distance/buffer. Too bad about existing hedge coming out.

Sorry to see old trees go unless it's absolutely necessary. Front hedge would be nice to retain. Back yard is of concern. Pool has no relationship to outbuildings and house. Back yard needs to be softened up to prevent it from becoming a basketball court as the children grow. Stonework on house isn't robust enough. Offset entry is good, particularly on busy street. West elevation needs more thought; More fenestration, less chimney. Having a plain hedge along property line is a good response in Shaughnessy. If original hedge can be kept, that would be fine.

Way too much hard surface, overwhelming. Front elevation isn't unified. Rectangular pool would be better. garage and pool house could be turned to open up back yard. Needs more green. East side of house could use more glazing. Basement stairs seem too close to pool area - unsafe. Garden work area /gates. Pool could move to allow more room from neighbour's pool area .

Use classic elements - brick chimney etc. Go straight to the books - arts and crafts principles. Garden has to be considered an extension of the house.

No vote taken as there was no quorum.

The meeting adjourned at 6:05.