

## First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

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

**Present:** Kathy Reichert, (Vice) Chair Resident Member at Large  
 Kilby Gibson Resident Member at Large  
 Carole Walker Angus Resident - SHPOA Member  
 Donna Aitken Resident - SHPOA Member  
 Lori Kozub Resident - SHPOA Member  
 Michelle McMaster BCCLA  
 Elisabeth Whitelaw BCCLA  
 Derek Neale AIBC  
 Clinton Cuddington AIBC  
 Judy Ross Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver

**Regrets/Absences:** \*Beth Noble, Chair Resident - SHPOA Member  
 \*Joan Nesbitt Resident Member at Large  
 \*Mamie Angus Resident Member at Large  
 \*Judith Hansen Heritage Commission Representative  
 \* leave of absence granted

**Recording Secretary:** Margot Keate West

**City Staff:** Sailen Black, Development Planner, UDDPC

### AGENDA

**Business:** 1. Review of the Minutes of June 7 and July 19, 2007  
 2. Projects Update

**Address:** 1402 McRae Avenue

**Applicant:** Formwerks Architectural Inc.

**Description:** Alterations and additions to the pre-1940 Heritage "A" listed house which is 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)

**Address:** 1628 Marpole Avenue

**Applicant:** Donna Chomichuk, Landscape Architect

**Description:** To consider the design of a cabana, pool and fence proposed in two concurrent applications.

**Review:** First

**Address:** 1288 The Crescent

**Inquirer:** John Keen MAIBC, Farpoint Architectural

**Description:** To consider a heritage report in support of demolition.

**Inquiry:** First (Packages sent out for June 7, 2007 meeting.) Site visit: September 22, 2006

This project was seen as the final item as the heritage consultant was not available until later.

**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:** Second

**Business:****1. Minutes to be Reviewed: June 7<sup>th</sup> and July 19, 2007**

Minutes of June 7th, 2007 were reviewed, and were approved as presented.  
Moved by Kathy Reichert; Seconded by Clinton Cuddington; Carried unanimously.

Minutes of July 19, 2007 were reviewed, and were approved as presented.  
Moved by Derek Neale; Seconded by Michelle McMaster; Carried unanimously.

**2. Recent Projects Update:**

- 3885 Selkirk Street (at Laurier Avenue): will be coming back to the Panel as a review.
  - 3537 Osler Street: Revisions will be made as informed by the Panel comment
3. Donna Aitken has resigned from the Panel as she is no longer a resident of First Shaughnessy District. Guests in attendance at tonight's meeting are Michael Roburn, and David Cuan (both SHPOA members and residents of FSD).
4. Michelle McMaster's email changed, and she was not informed about the site visit on Tuesday. Please note that her new email is McMaster@telus.net .

**Address:** 1402 McRae Avenue

**Applicant:** Formwerks Architectural Inc.

**Description:** Alterations and additions to the pre-1940 Heritage "A" listed house 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) (New material was? distributed at the meeting.)

**Introduction:** The project history was recapped by Vicky Potter:

- November, 2006 - co-design process
- February, 2007 - pre rezoning application review
- May-June, 2007 - open house at Hycroft
- June 7<sup>th</sup>, 2007 - Brought to panel as a rezoning application; advice back from Panel, who asked for a re-review.
- July, 2007 - open house at Hycroft towers

**Changes to Proposal/Architecture (Presented by applicant):**

End of upper unit (McRae street front) has been reconsidered and the end unit of the 5 unit building has been redesigned and detailed in stone. This creates a much stronger emphasis on the entry and relates back to the coach house. The town houses have been married in to a very similar design format. The Nichol house could have more dominance from having more distance from the main house. The 5 unit townhouses have been rotated /splayed to allow more distance between the two buildings. The end townhouse may be rotated further, so that it is roughly tangent to the curve of the street.

**Changes to Landscape:**

Additional planting between existing house and 5 units. From street frontage there is a larger buffer-zone visible between the two. Restoring the heritage gardens in front yard of the existing house. Planting and layout will be very similar to original.

**Panel Questions:**

- How much has distance between house and 5 unit building increased? 10-15 ft.
- Has it changed at the furthest building? No, but the southernmost unit is now closer to the pool deck
- How has Urban Design Panel's (UDP) comment re: Orientation of the 5 block townhouses has been addressed - altered by rotating it.
- Storm water? Exploring the technicalities of using the pond for this purpose. More free-board (depth) will be required.
- Appears that street frontage and Granville have more planting? No, hasn't' changed, but drawings have changed to reflect planting plan (last set of drawings showed the architecture stripped of planting)
- How many trees are coming down? All major trees on the upper lot are being retained (two fruit trees will come out. All self-seeding trees on the re-zoned portion will be cleared, with the possible exception of a larger maple in the south west corner of the lot.
- 10 townhouses are curved, 5 units are straight - could they be curved too? This has been considered. One of the principle reasons why this was not implemented was that the more the 5 units move downhill, the more it impacts on neighbouring house.

**Planning Comments:**

UDP Chair's summary includes a comment about the orientation of 5 unit townhouse, and a comment about reducing constriction between townhouse and Nichol house. Filigree landscape, concern about proximity, vote in favour of pitched roofs, concern over flat roofs.

**Panel Comments:**

Orientation of gate house seems more successful. Bookend approach is strong. Further rotation of end house would aid transition between stone end piece, and brink townhouses behind. Rotation or entire block is better, but still feels too close. Achilles heel of project. Visual barrier is good, but acoustics are problematic in regards to pool. Filigree is important. Highly concerned about 5 townhouses - new orientation is a big negative for the Nichol house. Pool area is closed in by garage, and further squeezed by closer townhouses. Apron of landscape around house is sorely lacking. Looks better from McRae, but to the detriment of the heritage house. Strengthening of gatehouse has improved things. Shift of townhouses creates good visual distance, but last three units need more robust masonry/green separation

between interface between townhouses and pool area. Attention to detail that wasn't there earlier on, geometry is stronger, spaces read better. Garden of heritage house is much stronger as well.

Rotating is an interesting solution, but is much too close to pool area. More physical distance between 5 unit building and pool. Two gateway units - good improvement on detailing. Like idea of further rotating southern bookend (gateway) unit. Can it be further detached from other 4 units to allow for more distance at back units. Flat roofs as deck space is still a concern. Want roof spaces to be invisible from street - umbrellas on rooftops will ruin architecture. Planting is fine. Existing landscape/restoration is a wonderful thing. Good for the preservation of the property. Coming along really nicely. Pitched roof to gatehouse and middle unit is great. Like revisions to front garden. Big contrast between expansive front yard and cramped back of Nichol house. Still too tight between 5 units and old house. Flat roofs are okay. Access to roof deck should be limited especially on 5 unit section where overlook to pool will be a problem. Like to see 5 units reduced or preferably eliminated.

Concerns about proximity around swimming pool in relation to noise, water etc. Gatehouse is improved. Not in favour of flat roofs. Primary issue is townhouse in relation to pool. Need sections, as the level drops. Depth of pond is an issue - security/safety in relation to insurance? Georgian classical scheme - pitched roof should have a small section of flat roof, rather than overhang with gutters. More mixing stone and brick in terms of palate. Seems monotonous. Strong three story classical elements bash into smaller brick buildings. From inside courtyard, this may not present well (and to house). Section needs to be seen in three dimensions. 5 unit building is too dense, Cramps back yard of main house. Materials are good, but relationship between old and new buildings is unclear.

**Chair's Summary:**

Orientation of gatehouse is good. Filigree has improved. Restoration is a good move, important to house. Mixed around roof form (concerns about privacy/visuals). Materials. 5 units - acoustics, too close to pool. Apron around building not complete, too close, noise. Storm water is an issue of concern.

**Rebuttal:**

Through continuous design, comments will be integrated. Thinking of eliminating the garage. More of the garage area turned over to trellis/planting will help gain back yard area for the main house. Parking would be relocated under existing house. Pool can be shifted.

**Planning Comments:**

Heritage is not supportive of demolishing relocated garage. The Panel's comments are expected on the material presented today, especially what you have received as part of package. Vote must reflect what has been presented as part of official presentation.

Development Permit to heritage house is one aspect, rezoning is another aspect, if successful at public hearing, that will go through the Development Permit process as a third.

**Motion:** To support the project with consideration given to the FSADP comments through the Development Permit stage of the rezoning for the lower lot.

Moved by : Derek Neale, seconded by Clinton Cuddington. 5 for, 4 against

Address: 1628 Marpole Avenue  
 Applicant: Donna Chomichuk, Landscape Architect  
 Description: To consider the design of a cabana, pool and fence proposed in two concurrent applications.  
 Review: First

#### Changes to the Proposal:

- Permit in for a fence and hedge. Second proposal is for pool and cabana project. Projects divided into two because permit for fence and hedge is linked to an existing HRA. This kicked in a new complication: FSD review of neighbour's property. Hedge is now being proposed completely on 1628 property (18" back from property line)
- Mixed plantings on inside of fence mostly 4 feet, some lower.
- Pool cabana - two options presented last time. More traditional style was favoured by Panel.
- Steep peak (vocabulary taken from front entrance) materials same as house. Granite will be matched if possible. Vaulted space inside. With natural light through gable ends. Indoor shower/powder room and change area on one end, and covered barbeque area on other end. Bermed change area/washroom into landscape to reduce visual impact.
- 302 sq. ft. still 1000 sq. ft. under allowable FSR.
- Doesn't impact on views of house, but not too cute either - has its own presence. Works with existing grades.
- Fortress mentality - front hedge is in bad shape. Replace existing 6 ft. wood fence with wrought iron fence set into property line, with planting in front to allow for controlled views into property. Larger Rhododendrons, etc. will allow different views into garden, while maintaining
- Firm enclosure of site, private gardens in front, enclosure granite low wall, fence lattices with hedge behind are all in guidelines. Code requirements for pool enclosure and height issues (over 2 foot drop from wall down to street) Need a fence at front for these reasons (safety of children too)
- Trying to keep views of the house from the street from being impacted by work.
- Removing non-heritage elements on site. 6ft. chain-link fence - aluminium picket fence along driveway

#### Panel Questions:

- Where's pool enclosure fence on either side of driveway? Existing chain-link fence imbedded in laurel hedge. Perimeter fence is pool safety hedge.
- Prefer to keep hedge and chain-link along front? No, preference would be for hedge and new iron fence.
- Eating area? Small table in former or patio - retaining walls will also provide seating. Informal entertaining, as there isn't space for formal seating.
- Materials? Pavers or natural stone If budget allows.
- Size of pool vis-a-vis cabana? Pool is a hike from house, so cabana is to provide services to allow you to stay on one level.
- How big is pool? 14' x 23' (shortened due to hedge movement)
- Wrought iron fence will go into ground? Eyes behind granite 4' wall existing. Sympathetic to existing front gate.
- Views from street? Obvious from front street? Open part is closer to street, planting in front to provide filigree, but not entirely hidden.
- Consider turning pool? Bites too far into grade. 8 ft. retaining walls
- Hot tub? Proposed for inclusion in front deck - will be sunk into deck level, not visible.
- Planting plan includes? Witch hazel, hydrangea, viburnum, mahonia, rhododendron, grasses, Magnolia, perennials etc.
- Why chain-link rather than wrought iron all the way back along west property line? Budget and also wanted continuous slope rather than stepped (as needed with wrought iron)
- 6 wrought iron fence at front would require relaxation of bylaw? Yes. Same as existing chain-link.

#### Planning Comments:

Four Areas: General relation of cabana in relation to house - vertically and horizontally. Height and position of new front fence. New stair that leads from terrace to open lawn area.

**Panel Comments:**

Leaded lights could catch smoke and trigger sprinklering.

Fence/security might be worthwhile for security reasons. 6 ft. would be okay as long as it's detailed properly. Full support. Berm is great. Slightly lower than deck makes for nice relationship. Leaded lights might presents ventilation challenges.

Black chain-link can be successful if the hedge grows through it property. Planting in front seems leggy. Natural flow up hillside is nice look. 4 ft. high fencing can get the height needed without needing a relaxation.

Not buying that you couldn't twist pool 90 degrees. Wonderful, great project.

Like design of cabana in relationship to home. Like repetition of rooflines, can't be scaled further. Chain-link will be fine. Turning pool would be worth considering.

Like cabana, don't like pool. Too close to driveway, to far away from house. Don't mind 6' wrought iron, set back with planting it will be fine. Like cabana, activity area nestled in nicely. Comprehensive space, nice splitting of functions. Nice proportions, nice roofline. Go for 6 ft. fence for security. Transparent. Nice looking project. Agree that cabana is well done, sits in landscape fits in nicely. No problem with height, pleasing to have stairs in middle, in keeping with style. Rotate pool. New stair makes all the sense in the world. Visually no problem from street. 6 ft. height is fine. Planted in informal way would be successful, but hedge would also work. Like design of cabana and relationship to house. Like fence recessed, with planting. 4 ft. would give softer look than 6 ft.. Looking though driveway view of cabana roofline might be disturbing - needs to be planted with this in mind. 4 ft. fence is good. Nice to see cabana sunken. Nice to see removal of aluminium fence. Two levels of steps are good. Discreet hot tub is good. Cabana looks great. Glass looks problematic from cleaning perspective. 6 ft. fence and stairs are good. Design provides all the tools, but no space to put the people - should be considered. Nicely done.

**Chair's Summary:**

Style structure of cabana is great. Six ft. fence was supported by most, denser planting around chain-link fence. Pool is liked, but turning it should be considered.

**Motion:** To support. Moved: Derek Neale; seconded: Kathy Reichert; carried unanimously.



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: Second

Kathy Reichert declared a conflict of interest as she is an immediate neighbour. She sat through the presentation as an observer.

#### Changes to Architecture:

Changes to hard landscaping, house has been adjusted to appear more symmetrical. Buttresses have been beefed up, chimney has been detailed differently to break up weight of stone. Colour - stucco - medium grey darker trim, cream stone.

House has been lowered a full foot. Stone wrapped around house,

Landscaping: hard surface has been reduced. More planting adjacent to stairs down, pathway at back has been reduced in size. Planted beds introduced to limit possibility of back paved area turning into basketball court. Gated area has been introduced in front.

Green hedging added at side. Adjusted shape and location of pool.

Samples presented for roofing: Roof Roc (composite slate-look material)

#### Panel Questions:

- Planter material? At grade with yew or buxus hedge planted.
- Has the house increased in size? No
- On lawn? Play structure
- SW elevation roofline -roof plan appears to have a conflict? 3 dormers are correct; big hipped roof is from last time.
- Owner plan on living in the house? Yes.
- Fenestration of family room side faces play area
- Amount of hard space is still of concern. Is area to east of garage paved? Sod/plastic rings type product.
- Visually, there is a lot of hardscape.
- Hot tub - concentric rings are decorative paving? Yes
- How wide? 4 ft. around sides. Pool moved back 4.5 ft.
- Mechanical for pool? In corner of garage
- Size of pool? 16 ft. x 32 ft.
- Paving material? Roman pavers with gaps between pavers for permeability
- Fencing? Perimeter fence, likely wood at sides and back, with metal fence and hedging at front.
- Patterning of patio? Executed in change of patterning of materials (same materials)

#### Planning Comments:

Looking for Panel's comments on the landscape and architectural design, including items previously identified by Panel such as hard surface, symmetry of front elevation, and placement of pool.

#### Panel Comments:

Improvement over last scheme. Headed in right direction, done in a reasonable way. Getting rid of two large trees at front is good. Symmetry has been addressed. Like treatment of chimney. NW elevation shows trellis that doesn't fit. Like new pool and hot tub. Like proximity of fireplace. Worried about hard surface - would like to see that reduced. Front elevation is good. Concerned about roof material. Gutter finished in 'wood finish' sounds dubious. Like to see what they'll look like. Handsome house.

Landscape is amorphous without a lot of definition. Circles, rectangles wiggling around. Sections through would help to explore how client might want to use different areas - outdoor rooms for different purposes. Planting under eaves won't be irrigated from October to March

Planting list is unreadable. Looks really busy. Looks high maintenance. Needs a more careful look at landscape. Should relate better to house and can work better for clients. Development of landscape design needs work. More possibility to reflect what the house is into the landscape. Entry gates should

reflect buttressing detail of house. Sheer visual amount of paving in rear garden is of concern. Every inch of paving should be considered - is it necessary? Paving on either side of front stairs will look strange. House itself - chimney doesn't work yet, although inset is nice. Breaking up surface.

Roof - guidelines talk about authentic materials. This isn't authentic. Concern about hard scape, drainage difficulties. Symmetry is good. Pool relocation is better. Soft perimeter of pool is good. Hottub/pool looks dangerous. Lattice on upper terrace is visually disturbing.

Symmetry exists in elevation, but not in plan. Nice to see this as a massing model. Stone looks like ledge-stone or something small. Needs to be more robust.

Rear elevation isn't symmetrical at all. Stone posts and trellis is alien to architecture. 6 ft. overhang over balcony and glass railing. Modeling would help

Trellis structure at back doesn't do anything functionally, but doesn't relate to architecture in any way. Having a hard time reading drawings - model is necessary. Feel strongly that real materials would help this project immensely. Front façade feels like it can breathe, other façades look like an explosion of ideas. No cohesion. Lots of disparate elements coming together. Little attention paid to proximity of elements. Creates thinness - windows too close to buttresses etc.

Punch window building. Back looks over the top in terms of number and types of windows. Planting is much better than last time. Rima pavers are great for permeability. Thyme can be introduced to soften look of pavers while maintaining functionality.

New types of materials should be considered - while continuing to be highly selective. Specs on roofing materials are necessary. Need conviction - something that will make a good ruin.

Too many things going on - needs restraint, simplification. Back yard still looks piecemeal. There needs to be an overall plan so that it reads as an extension of the home. Go back to drawing board for whole back yard. Rearranging parts has got you partway there, but not as far as you need to be.

**Chair's Summary:**

Roof - more material/specs needed. Hard surface - some improvement, more needed. Symmetry is better. Model is needed for application. Front façade is an improvement over last time. Landscaping needs more thought - sections through, simpler planting plan. Improved front entrance.

**Straw Poll:** That this move forward as an application: 6 for, 2 against.



Address: 1288 The Crescent  
 Inquirer: John Keen MAIBC, Farpoint Architectural  
 Description: To consider a heritage report in support of demolition.  
 Inquiry: First (See packages sent out for June 7, 2007 meeting.)  
 Site visit: September 22, 2006 and again on October 30, 2007.

The owner regrets his inability to attend.

**Proposal:**

To demolish existing pre-date house, and construct new single family dwelling. Owner bought house in 1995. Proposal was brought to FSDAP, and later cancelled for personal reasons. Site visit with second architect led to design proposal for retention of front façade. Recently, a third attempt at development has been considered. City asked for heritage assessment of existing house.

**Heritage Assessment - Provided by consultant Don Luxton:**

House has not been listed on heritage register. No previous research profile or assessment. Checked all archival sources. Built 1929 for TR Lee and Mary Lee. Inconsistent pattern of short term ownership. Completed just before depression. Chain of ownership listed on page 2. No architect association with design of original house. Design provided by contractor JL Northey and Sons. Example of later eclectic Arts and Crafts - period revival style common between two wars. Storey-book cottage style - pastiche of historical styles. Hollywood stage set style of architecture. Some design history. Lacks a lot of details seen on better examples (West Broadway and Crown Street at 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue).

No numerical assessment done. Values based assessment on City's guidelines. Poor example of style, little cultural history, instable pattern of ownership, no particular association with anyone significant. Settlement/development patterns - arrives 20 years after big FSD houses. Doesn't suit context of The Crescent. Contextual value - first building on site, not connected to first development of FSD. Rear of site substantially altered. Some landscape value. Suits context of neighbourhood, not a landmark. Front of house is fairly authentic, back is quite altered. Interior has been modified, house is not in great shape. A numerical assessment might get it to 'c' level. Heritage value is minor in comparison to its context. Options for conservation considered. Secondary dwelling, addition, subdivision or density transfer would be tools that would work. No phenomenal architectural expression on its façade - building codes would make rain-screening necessary, windows would have to be replaced etc.

Can't be said to have no heritage value, but has minor heritage value in this context. Little that could meaningfully conserved. Doesn't have high enough significance to require extraordinary measures

Offer house for relocation. Should be documented for archival purposes.

**Panel Questions:**

- Infill - was there a study done? No, owner wants a single family house. Seemed contrary to estate like character of The Crescent.
- What is meaning full conservation? If there is an addition to a historic building, it should be sympathetic, compatible distinguishable and subordinate (Standards and guidelines #11). If conservation is meaningful it has to respect historic resource. What it illustrates is a period/point in time - if it is altered it won't even have that. Scale of existing house is at odds than what is proposed.
- For sale for several years. Is owner serious about building his dream house? History - owner expected to build a house, and it didn't go that way, so he became disheartened. Listing has expired.

**Planning Comments:**

The Panel has seen this project before and expressed desire to retain. Does the Panel have any different advice today?

**Panel Comments:**

Why should we reward an owner for demolition by neglect? Has owner attempted to present this in more saleable fashion? If house was moved somewhere else, it would be okay as long as replacement was really special. No process in place to demand that owner do that. Recognize that times have changed as have expectations for modern living. Still sorry to see it go . Not in favour of keeping façade last time.

Still feel that way. Swaying back and forth - concerned that house has been neglected for a number of years. Still in favour of retaining house. Move it or demolish it either way is okay. 20,000 sq. ft. house sounds like a bad plan environmentally. Could take several infills and provide multiple dwelling units. Case could be made to move it and free up site. Don't really know which way to go. Eclecticism is important to FSD. Push towards standardizing FSD creates monotony. Odd man out/ebb and flow is what makes a walk through Shaughnessy interesting/important.

Nostalgia isn't a good enough excuse for retention. This is a grand opportunity for the city to exercise its eco-density through infills. Would be meaningful to keep it in situ.

Rewarding someone for neglecting is not right. Move house on site for infill.

Neglect is bothersome. Sorry to see the smaller houses go and be replaced with built-out houses that fully maximize FSR. Whatever is done needs to be in character with what is there now.

**Chair's Summary:**

Some Panel members believed that house should stay. Anxious about how property has been treated in recent years. Others believe that the house could be moved or torn down.

**Rebuttal:**

Assessment is not based on structural condition/ neglect, etc. If this were a smaller house of significant design it would be different.

**Motion:** That the Panel not support demolition. Moved: Derek Neale, Seconded: Judy Ross: 6 for, 2 against.

**Motion to Adjourn:** Moved: Lori Kozub, Seconded: Carole Walker Angus; Carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 7:45 pm.