
First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

Minutes of the Meeting of January 17, 2008

Present:	Beth Noble, Chair Kathy Reichert, Vice-Chair Kilby Gibson Joan Nesbitt Lori Kozub Michelle McMaster Elisabeth Whitelaw Clinton Cuddington Judy Ross	Resident - SHPOA Member Resident Member at Large Resident Member at Large Resident Member at Large Resident - SHPOA Member BCSLA BCSLA AIBC Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver
Regrets/Absences:	Mamie Angus Carole Walker Angus David Cuan Judith Hansen Vacant	Resident Member at Large Resident - SHPOA Member Resident - SHPOA Member Heritage Commission Representative AIBC
Recording Secretary:	Margot Keate West	
City Staff:	Sailen Black, Planner	

AGENDA

- Business:**
1. Review of the Minutes of December 13, 2008
 2. Projects Update
- Address:** **1947 West King Edward Avenue**
Inquirer: Paolo Salvador, Inline Design
Description: To consider the design of a single-family house and landscape proposed for this site.
Application: First (DE411723)
- Address:** **1864 West 19th Avenue**
Inquirer: Stefan Wiedemann, Architect
Description: To consider a proposed renovation and new garage at this pre-1940 property.
Inquiry: First
- Address:** **1288 The Crescent**
Inquirer: John Keen MAIBC, Farpoint Architectural
Description: To consider the design and landscape of a new house on this pre-1940 site.
Inquiry: Third

Business

Minutes of Dec. 13th, 2007 were discussed. Carole Walker-Angus was not at the meeting of Dec. 13th.

Derek Neale has resigned from Panel and was not present either.

Motion to accept with changes: Moved by Clinton Cuddingtin; seconded: Lori Kozub; carried unanimously.

Attendance: Panel members were reminded that they are requested to inform the chair if they are unable to attend meetings. That said, if a panel member is unable to attend 4 meetings in a row they may be asked to resign their position (this is outlined in the city clerk's terms of reference.) Habitual absences are frustrating to other panel members as it is difficult to achieve quorum. The professional members have been good at checking to see that their counterpart member is going to be present when they can't be. The same should be happening among residents. It was suggested that residents should consider instituting a buddy system to ensure that quorum is achieved each meeting. The chair will be sending a note to those members who have missed 3-4 meetings. In the case that members can foresee missing meetings due to extraordinary circumstances, a leave of absence may be granted. Members are asked to kindly coordinate with chair and fellow members.

Lori Kozub will set up a group email list so that members can confirm their attendance in order to ensure quorum.

Disbanding of Committees and Panels: City clerk notes that FSADP is automatically discharged by Dec. 8, 2008. They have said they will try to have the Panel reappointed prior to the Dec. 18th meeting, but this may or may not happen. The Panel decided to strike this meeting in the event that this does not happen smoothly.

Panel Comments on Projects: Planning reminded the panel that projects that are problematic may still be brought to the Panel. Don't let projects slide. Get specific about the problems. Comments about individuals are not appropriate, but any comments about the project as presented are encouraged. If projects shouldn't pass 'go', please say it.

Planning wants constructive, specific, design oriented comments. Please use the guidelines and ODP (Official Development Plan) as a yardstick against which to measure proposed designs. What FSD is after is excellence in architecture.

Recent Projects Update:

1402 McRae Avenue: Was referred by council to Public Hearings which begin February 12th, 2008.

1707 Angus Drive: Chain link fence - was this approved?

Address: 1947 West King Edward Avenue
Inquirer: Paolo Salvador, Inline Design
Description: To consider the design of a single-family house and landscape proposed for this site.
Application: First (DE411723)

Conflict of Interest:

Kathy Reichart declared a conflict of interest as an immediate neighbour and abstained from any voting for this project.

Proposal:

This has been seen twice before as an enquiry.

Buttresses wrap around home, stone wraps around, fenestration lines up better.

Trellis on master bedroom is to be maintained. Owner has elected to go back to single dormer on front rather than three as shown last time.

Updates to Architecture:

Reduced patio in size. Better proximity between cooking area and kitchen

Beefed up shrub bed around perimeter, lawn between back of house and garage is slightly more sloped. Entry from King Ed is revised to provide more of a threshold.

Reduced hard surface, added two steps up to garage due to grade change. Drop in grade at front of house.

Panel Questions:

Is large cedar being retained at back? Not the one in the footprint of the garage.

How many trees are being removed? Around 18 - will check for next time.

Paving material on patio? Permeable Pavers

Why only Flagstones on west side? Gives feel of more natural walkway

Rock wall on front property line? Low (18") stone fence with metal above.

Contour lines on plan are not labeled at all. Hard to determine what's going on? Previous package (June) shows existing spot grades, which are being maintained.

Not asking for any relaxations? No. House has been dropped a foot so that it complies completely.

Front walkway material? Universal pavers.

Planning Comments:

Planning would like to hear whether points identified by Panel have been adequately addressed by applicant (acknowledging applicant's point that computer program has not rendered the intended design very well).

Panel comments from the last time included concern about disparate elements ('an explosion of ideas') and requirement for more cohesion on sides and back facades. Concern about authenticity of materials (gutter & roof), more restraint, and simplification of design.

Panel Comments:

Issues with chimney haven't been addressed. Need to have full package with materials, etc. in order to remember what has changed, what comments have been addressed (or not). Trying to cobble together whole idea from a number of packages is very difficult. Model isn't representative, drawings aren't representative - very difficult to respond to something so nebulous. Trellises are troubling and need to be refined or preferably removed. Details of materials, overhang, fenestration etc. have to be hammered out at this stage. Can't comment on incomplete package. Trellises feel too suburban, unrefined. Don't add to the house adequately. Back is too complicated - double bay at back seems inconsistent with front façade. Looks like a different house. Post in front of breakfast nook - only supporting a trellis and should come out. Much more of an obstruction than necessary. Take a look at relocating BBQ slightly so that it's not central to that

window. Trellises are not right for this style of house - try to find another language. Chimney needs to be addressed. New entry feels more gracious, circular lawn is nice. Entry looks foreboding with deck overtop. Looks like you're walking in to a black hole - pillars feel heavy and worrisome. Dormer on top is an improvement, but scale of it seems small for such a big roof. Rear trellises are not good. There's a whole lot happening in that back yard. Massive amount of hard space. Post off of breakfast area is bad. Trellises add to confusion. Don't like either of the trellises. Materials board will help. Need to understand how it all works together. Need to see relationship between landscape materials and building materials.

Guidelines talk about prominent roofs. This looks like it's about celebrating the limits. Roof should be better resolved rather than just what's left over. Fascias at back illustrate complexity of rooflines - needs to be more bold. Roof is too understated. Window treatments on side facades feel pedestrian - don't feel like same house. Windows look like they're driven by interior needs without being resolved on exterior. Relationship to King Edward is tenuous- wonder if landscape at front is going to allow more sound through (given that house is forward on lot).

Landscape is much improved. Would like to see grades on further plans. Notice a retaining wall on North side of pool a 4' height - concern about neighbour's trees on adjacent property. Can pool be dropped? Separation between garage and pool house (seat wall) - doesn't appear to be enough space for this. Some confusion about grade changes around hot tub etc. a number of things weren't addressed - foundation plantings under overhangs (in winter with no irrigation), very difficult to read plant list - needs to be legible even when reduced. Landscape hasn't been well resolved. Part is curvilinear and part is extremely rigid. Curvilinear doesn't flow, and rigid is made up of lots of bits and pieces. Simplicity is important here. Calmer, more intent needed rather than just designs on a piece of paper. Sections through different areas would help. Figure out different spaces, and how they can work better. Materials need to talk to each other. Please bring in samples. You can grow through square pavers as well (no need for a different material on one side of house).

Chair's Summary:

general consensus that more details are required before more constructive comments can be made. Questions and concern about whether house works as a whole, or if there are just too many disparate elements. The Panel needs a better ability to see changes in heights at rear. Nobody was in favour of the trellises. Concern about front entrance, concern about landscape plan (hard to read) and could benefit from consideration and simplification. More consistent architectural theme needed. Enhance roofscape.

Motion: To see this again with comments addressed. Moved: Lori Kozub; Seconded: Beth Noble; Carried unanimously.

Address: 1864 West 19th Avenue
Inquirer: Stefan Wiedemann, Architect
Description: To consider a proposed renovation and new garage at this pre-1940 property.
Inquiry: First

Program:

Existing 2-storey building, with two accesses. Plan is to take out driveway in front yard completely and replace with pedestrian access. Porte cochere will be transformed into covered porch. Raise house by 2 ft. to increase ceiling height in basement. Retain existing porte cochere roof and columns, keeping columns simple in keeping with house, retaining as much of original building as possible. Low profile to roof of new garage. Current garage is in non-conforming location. This will be removed. Creating lawn between house and garage. Focus is to create some yard adjacent to kitchen. Small walkway up to first flight of stairs, leading to wide staircase under porte cochere. New fenestration on back, but consistent with original. Client wants to replace/retain shutters on front of building: Black shutters, white windows, warm grey body. Keep as much landscape as possible. 1 tree being removed for garage/garden shed. Couple of fruit trees may go if necessary. Adding trees and shrubbery at front. Romantic garden path will come off of front walkway and wrap around to side of house.

Panel Questions:

- Concrete strip on east side? Sidewalk
- Why is it there when it's going to an area that isn't paved? anomalous looking? No good answer. More consistent to wrap drain strip around side of house.
- Landscape plan shows a sidewalk between garage and house - is this an extra line? Yes, line shouldn't be there.
- Trees by proposed garage? To be removed
- Relaxations? None required, building is within envelope: 2 ft. from property line, and 2 ft from lane at narrowest point
- Access? From lane which runs along side of house.
- Adjacent property? Garage immediately on other side of fence.
- Open trellis? Yes
- Sunken or raised area at back? Raised to provide access with new height of house. Patio will be on grade with house.
- Windows on plinth at back? No, no access or windows from back.
- Storm water retention? Not required, decreasing impermeable surface from existing condition.
- Diagonal pattern of front stairs? To prevent look of waterfall of stairs. A lot of stairs up to front of house - allows for landscaping to soften it.
- Back corner? No intention to do anything at the moment. Depressed area with little planting at the moment. May be developed as a jungle gym for kids.
- Big tree in back? Two: One subject property, one straddles property line. Both being retained. Deciduous trees.

Planning Comments:

Does the Panel have any comments on landscape and architecture as proposed.

Panel Comments:

Compliment clients for retaining house. Renovations proposed are consistent with existing house, and arch. Should be complemented for this. If removing circular drive suits owners, fine. Raising house might help it, but 2 feet sounds like too much - 18" would be better. Remove strip of concrete along side of house. More landscape design may be needed at some point. Wonderful that impermeability has been reduced. Like colour scheme. Like new jogged entry. Raising house is fine. Symmetry of front is good. Presents very well. Landscape feels sparse. Neighbour considerations have to be taken with budgetary considerations. Landscape needs to be perked up. Congratulate clients on retaining a Shaughnessy home and giving it new life. Attractive home. Things proposed are consistent with style and proportion of home. Landscape needs to be thought

out - there won't be a lot left after renovations. Happy that client has decided to raise house and retain look of original architecture. Removing circular driveway will be a great opportunity for new landscaping that will soften the front. Back façade is back to what it always wanted to be. Sandblasted concrete base runs risk of being alien to rest of house. Having it tie in to rest of landscape would help. Cast concrete has to be detailed well. Saw cutting has to be watched. Entranceway is a primary area of attention. Could be tunnel-like. Project is excellent. Good package easy to read and understand. Needs a lot of landscaping - maybe a phased plan would be manageable. Fabulous. Thrilled when looking through package. Nice that so little of existing house is being changed. Worried about concrete base and how it will tie in.

New windows on basement level look pretty open and bare. Some base planting is needed. Very nicely handled. Pleased that driveway is being removed. Nice how stairs shift over. Back of house could be broken up some more. Looks like it will work extremely well. Windows in back work well to differentiate between new and old parts of house. Like how rear is fitting into land, like trellis as well. Nice to see trellis pick up on porte cochere language and lines.

Chair's Summary:

Complimented applicant on retention of house and sensitive approach, renovation looks good. Concern about concrete base, and developing a suitable landscape

Architect's Comments:

Landscape will help to conceal bare concrete base. Cascading planting can also be used. Fenestration on back is meant to contrast with original. Client wants open plan where they can open up interior to exterior during the summer. Front of house and back shouldn't be the same. Trellis is there to soften the back, front is more rigid.

Motion: To support as presented with comments addressed. Moved: Judy Ross; Seconded: Lori Kozub; one opposed.

Address: **1288 The Crescent**
 Inquirer: John Keen MAIBC, Farpoint Architectural
 Landscape Architect: Donna Chomichuk
 Description: To consider the design and landscape of a new house on this pre-1940 site.
 Inquiry: Third

Proposal:

To build a new single family residence in the Spanish Mission style. The Crescent is 1910-20's houses. This house will fit within this. The owner would like something more contemporary, and the design team is trying to make this work together. Warmer more exciting colour palate - regionally sensitive, larger windows, etc.

Accessory building in rear yard has been re-designed (450-500 sq ft.) as a tea house, in same location. House includes 8 stalls of below grade parking (2200 excluded from FSR).

Retaining walls leading to underground parking happen to work with grade of parking. By retaining existing access, the driveway retaining walls end up at 3 ft. 6 in. at the highest point. Doors aren't visible from street. Existing site cover is 6.6%. Proposed is 18%. Trying to keep as much green space as possible.

House is within FSR. Trying to retain existing setback. About same place, but two columns of porte cochere will land 5/5-6' into front yard setback. Architectural appurtenance proposed for tower to punch through 35 ft. height limit. (to 38 or 40 ft.- still shorter than many of the houses around The Crescent). Design is still in sketch stage.

Landscape:

Landscape isn't just apron around house. House embraces the rear garden - orchard, rose garden, vegetable garden. Proposed feature in lawn with classical/mission style open structure with columns.

Shallow reflecting pools on both sides of front door, with details around.

Arrangement provides maximum amount of privacy for neighbours

Panel Questions:

- Definition of appurtenance? Non-habitable space such as a cupola, weather vane, turret roof, etc.
- Bowling alley and parking alley that extend beyond front of house? Doesn't encroach in to front yard, so not an issue.
- How do windows work in bowling alley? Could be considered as part of rec. room.
- Is there a problem with two major houses being built in same style? Proportions of 1498 Angus is dissimilar in terms of proportion and massing. There is repetition of style throughout FSD, and Spanish Mission is one of the original styles represented (see FSD style manual).
- Why are you advocating this style? Client asked for Spanish mission style contemporary Florida home. Architect is trying to move client towards something more in keeping with FSD.
- Colour? Cheery but not roof. Terracotta roof (not red) - Nuance is critical
- Relaxation of front yard setback? Portion encroaching is 5'5" x 14', 29.5 ft to front property line.
- Trees in back won't allow roses to grow? Lots of those trees blown down in the big storm last year.
- Roof over garden feature? Will it complement teahouse? Yes, an open air structure with roof, but two buildings will relate/ be sympathetic.
- FSR? Maximum including teahouse and some of parking spaces that don't fall under habitable space.
- Drop from terrace to lower patio? 10 feet, a full floor

- Caretaker building relates to conservatory how? Caretaker is above spa functions for pool. Spa is accessed ½ floor below pool level. Caretaker's are accessed from main floor of house on the floor above.
- Would like to know impervious surface numbers.

Planning Comments:

Looking for comments on landscape and architecture proposed.

Panel Comments:

Study of elevation of houses on The Crescent would be helpful. Spanish revival style needs more work. Looks squat - needs architectural appurtenance, any additional height would be good. Spanish style calls for elongation. Back/east elevation and west are massive, without the finesse and Spanish expression. Needs coordination all the way around. Landscape - terraces need to be considered - layers, hardscape one level to another. Overkill to have tea pavilion and a feature - feels heavy. Challenging to make that work. Reflecting pools are weird because it would normally be out into setback area. Needs to be thought through. Don't like terracotta roofs. Encourage Spanish-ness in landscape as well. Landscape reads as more English than Spanish.

The houses of this style in FSD work because they don't spread out. They sit high on their lots. Feels like it needs to be set back in lot away from street. Water features in front eliminate planting beds, and this impacts sense of distance from street. Needs more estate-like feel. Having trouble with relaxation into front yard. 5-8 cars is too much in a residence.

Like it. Bold move on The Crescent. Mature trees on crescent allows for a fair amount of disparity. Colour will have to be very carefully considered. Foot print is interesting on lot. Creates interesting spaces. Nice changes of grade. Feature in back lawn isn't well resolved. Needs to interact with tea pavilion better. Like rest of landscaping. Don't know about two reflecting pools. Liked comment about Spanish feel to landscape. Important to have an individual creation, not a copy of something else. Don't want to see a laundry list of client's desires. Elements need to speak to the chosen style. Don't want porte cochere encroaching on front. Concerned about water features and proximity to house. Like to see parking spots reduced. Concerned about final colour of house. Crescent is muted/subdued, and this should fit in. Back patio/terrace needs to be reconsidered in terms of drops/railings/views.

Higher tower needs to be there to make composition work. Front of building is strong and landscape needs to be the counterpoint. Landscape needs some shagginess. Classicism in back feature seems like wrong approach. Helpful if landscape could just dive in to house at back. Doesn't feel understated enough for FSD. Feels too loud. Doesn't work. Too crowded on this property. Front façade is okay, but other elevations need finesse. Looks too much like a hotel rather than a private residence. Wouldn't encourage intrusion into front yard setback. Need a landscape plan that reflects style of house. Not in favour of 8 parking spaces.

Chair's Summary:

Some liked style, more disliked it. Landscape needs to be used more in concert with architecture if you continue with Mission theme. Less parking spaces, front yard setback not favourable.

Motion: To return as an enquiry with comments addressed. Moved: Lori Kozub; seconded: Joan Nesbitt; 5 for, 3 opposed.

Meeting adjourned.