

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

Minutes of the Meeting of February 28, 2008

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

AGENDA

Business:	1. Review of the Minutes of January 17, 2008 2. New Panel members 3. Recent Projects Update 4. New Business
Address:	1056 Matthews Avenue
Inquirer:	Loy Leyland, Loy Leyland Architect Inc.
Description:	To consider the design of a single-family house and landscape proposed for this newly subdivided site.
Inquiry:	First
Address:	1927 West 17th Avenue
Inquirer:	James Emery, Iredale Architecture Group
Description:	To consider proposed changes to this VHR "A" listed building, including the design of the proposed garden room and alterations to the front door, in connection with designation of the building. The Vancouver Heritage Commission has requested that changes to "A" Buildings in the First Shaughnessy Design area be presented at the First Shaughnessy Design Panel first.
Review:	First
Address:	1288 The Crescent
Inquirer:	John Keen, Farpoint Architectural Inc.
Description:	To consider the proposed landscape and design of a new house with below-grade parking. This is the second inquiry regarding the new house and landscape, and the fourth regarding this site.
Inquiry:	Fourth

Business:

1. **Minutes of January 17, 2008** were reviewed, and were approved as presented. Moved and Seconded; Carried unanimously.
2. **New Panel Members:** Loy Leyland was formally welcomed to the Committee by Beth Noble. There was a brief discussion around Clifford Cuddington stepping down in March. (His replacement has been appointed - John Keen, MAIBC)
3. **Recent Projects Update** - No new projects
4. **New Business:**

Attendance: The importance of this was raised again. It was noted that there were enough members present to meet quorum. The issue of absences was briefly reviewed with everyone in agreement that after 4 consecutive absences a Committee member will be asked to resign.

Chain link fence at 1707 Angus Drive: City staff looked into this and it meets the requirements as it is going to be hidden behind a large laurel hedge.

Rezoning at 1402 McRae Avenue: Public hearing re: the building of townhomes did not complete. Thus, has been set over until March 10th, 2008.

General Issue: Committee needs to speak their mind early on if they have concerns regarding any project on the table. Members need to clearly state specific reasons why they don't support either the project or the architecture early on in the process. Be as specific as possible and speak your piece. Otherwise, these issues can rear their head at a later stage in the discussion. The importance of referring to the First Shaughnessy Guidelines and ODP was stressed.

Setbacks and Guidelines: A question was asked about whether the above has been reviewed prior to going before the Committee. There is a technical plan check after the Committee has reviewed the project and before it proceeds ahead. Though not highly likely, it is possible that the architecture of the building may be impacted by a technical issue, and the project may have to come back to the Committee for further review. Alternately, the technical problems may be addressed via a request for a relaxation.

Role of the Committee: Whether the Committee fully understands what their role is. It is members' responsibility to be confident about what they are voting on and to understand the issues that planning has identified with respect to each project.

Reading of Previous Planning Documents: In conjunction with the above, Beth raised the issue whether she should read out the previous minutes, especially in cases whereby we are reviewing a project for the 2nd or 3rd time. It was agreed upon by all that this was redundant and not necessary as the responsibility rests with individual panel members to review notes in advance.

Address: **1056 Matthews Avenue**
Inquirer: Loy Leyland, Loy Leyland Architect Inc.
Description: To consider the design of a single-family house and landscape proposed for this newly subdivided site.
Inquiry: First

Architects Presentation:

Proposal for a new home to replace an existing older home of little value. Concerns were raised by the architect re: the slope of the site, the irregular shape of the lot and whether it is possible to save mature trees and shrubs on the property, most notably a Monkey Puzzle Tree and large rhododendron and some holly trees. It was noted that many of the large trees have been badly pruned. Moreover, there is an existing stone wall that may or may not be able to be retained, depending on how the front of the house is accessed. With respect to this latter point, two options were presented. One involved punching through the existing wall to access the front porch. The second involved going around the existing wall which is presently tipping forward. It will need to either be retained or replaced with a similar structure.

In addition to the above, the architect arrived with five options in terms of the façade for the new home being proposed. The issue of height was discussed: in response to this, it was noted that the overall design of the house had been “toned down,” with roof lines being tightened up.

Panel Questions:

- How many significant trees will be cut down? Uncertain. Perhaps 4 in total.
- Have the existing trees been assessed by an arborist? No.
- If the front retaining wall is removed will it be replaced with a similar wall? Yes.
- What will the masonry technique be for the above? Split face.
- Given the proposed house has a turret, how many homes exist in the neighbourhood with a similar feature? “Don’t know.”
- Why is a detached garage not being considered, i.e., as opposed to parking being put under the house? Because square footage for the house will be lost.
- Are all the patios pavers? Yes.
- Height of planting in front? Ten feet.
- Is there going to be a pedestrian walkway to front door? Yes, probably a ramp of some sort.
- Difference between front and back yard elevations? 7.5 feet
- What does the planting between this property and the adjoining neighbours look like? Significant hedge.
- Which of the five options do you like best? Octagon shape.
- Which of the five options do you like least? Matched gables.
- Do you have drawings to show the tower at the proposed higher height (greater than 35 feet)? No, but five feet would create the necessary volume. This would result in a new ceiling height of approximately 12 feet. It would also bring the top of the tower to the height of the roof. The trade-off would be to reduce the footprint in order to increase the height.
- How often has this design element been used? We don’t want to recreate this feature unnecessarily?” Don’t know.
- Is there going to be a planned BBQ area? In all likelihood but not certain exactly where this will be.

Planning Comments

Planning started off by stating that the architect has tackled some of these issues. They are looking for Panel comment on the following items:

1. The pedestrian entry from Matthews to the front door, given the site situation
2. The continuity of expression around the four sides of the house
3. Proposed tree removals on the north side
4. Proposal by the architect of taller height for the dome roof

Panel Comments:

Most members like the idea of changing the entrance. However, this raises the issue of the paving around it.

Perhaps if the cut in the concrete could be moved as far away from the Monkey Puzzle Tree as possible, it would be desirable to keep the large rhodo at all costs. It needs more pedestrian access to the front/middle of the house. The driveway reads as being too close to the adjacent property. The house/porch could be moved to the East. It also reads too deep as a seven ft. drop seems extreme. The rhodo helps establish the filtering of the site from the road. Trees and shrubs could be reshaped or re-prune if necessary and should be kept as many as possible. Their scale helps to proportion the house. The building has too many confusing elements, for example, the six façade options haven't really simplified anything. Option E is not necessary. Preference would be for option A, B or C. The issue of the tower height will need to be resolved once one of the options has been agreed upon. It could possibly be considered going higher. The tower should be raised if you are wedded to this motif. An arborist's report is required. The concern has to do with the North wall proximity to the neighbour's hedge. Continuity of Expression needs to be solidified. One member would like to see a detached garage.

Summary of Panel's Comments:

Raise height of the tower. Exterior needs more work. Do not remove trees prior to an arborist's report being done. Save large rhododendron if at all possible. New entry is fine. Add separate garage. Move building site to the East.

Motion: to support with comments addressed. Moved and Seconded: Carried unanimously.

Address: 1927 West 17th Avenue
Inquirer: James Emery, Iredale Architecture Group
Description: To consider proposed changes to this VHR "A" listed building, including the design of the proposed garden room and alterations to the front door, in connection with designation of the building. The Vancouver Heritage Commission has requested that changes to "A" Buildings in the First Shaughnessy Design area be presented at the First Shaughnessy Design Panel first.
Review: First

Architects Presentation:

An overview of the project was offered. It was explained to the Committee that this is the second phase of the renovation. That is, all, mechanical, sprinklers, etc., were previously addressed by the same owner. The owner of the house went on to explain that he is sympathetic to the character of the house. What he now wants to do is connect the house with the lot. With respect to this 2nd phase of the renovation, the following four changes were proposed:

1. Reintroduce a more traditional entrance.
2. Add a solarium and deck to the side yard in order to mitigate between the ground plane and the house. It was explained that presently there is a "disconnect" between the two.
3. Minor Garage Reno: extend it by five feet in order to create more storage, while at same time it keeping it very traditional looking.
4. Remove Exterior Clutter, e.g., fire escapes, etc.

Before proceeding further, the following history of the houses was proffered:

The house was built in 1912 by a carpenter;
It has a very unusual floor plan, including a side entrance;
It is presently single family but historically was a rooming/boarding house that had seven units;
In the 1980's this was reduced to three units;
The present owner bought the house four years ago.

Panel Questions:

- Has the property been sub-divided, and was it originally connected to the property to the East of the house? Yes.
- Does the proposal on the table comply with setback regulations? The garage does. The house does not.
- Question around FSR. The Committee was referred to review their handouts. It was noted that it is a little less than 10%.
- What heritage lists, if any, is the house presently on? Category "A" home on the Heritage List. Presently seeking Heritage Designation for the exterior.
- Where was the original entry? Don't know.
- A concern/question was raised re: the rock pit. You won't see it.
- Why weren't existing roof styles of the house incorporated into the turret on the proposed solarium? It just wasn't considered. But open to a more whimsical roof style that may more closely mirror the house.
- What is going to be changed re: the landscape design? Nothing
- Will the pavers be permeable or impermeable? Permeable.
- Why a covered porch? Greater utility of outdoor space for young children.
- Is the patio going to end up being a sunroom? Not at this time.

Planning Comments:

No major concerns. Looking for general comments on the architecture and landscape proposed.

Panel Comments:

Know house well. Commend approval. No concerns. Glad to see a separate garage. Need to make distinction between heritage status and revision. The base of the revision should match the house. Would prefer if the porch weren't covered, i.e., strive for a softer look. The doors are a nice improvement, as is removing the fire escapes. It is wonderful! Congratulations! It is very functional. Landscape should reflect the heritage status of the house. The solarium/deck is good but it should be done in stone as opposed to wood, i.e., it should read as more of a permanent terrace. Make the

garage reno the full width. Applaud efforts. It will read much better sans fire escapes. The extension of the roof is very awkward. Use the same treatment on the base of the solarium as on the house. Do not cover the extended porch. Issue of garage setback needs to be addressed. Do not cover the solarium. Have the roof of the solarium more closely mimic the roof of the turret on the house. A stone terrace would be a huge improvement over a wooden deck. A single door for the entry. The columns at the front door need to be more substantial. Try to reduce the height of the deck and have a lower railing. Would prefer more whimsical turret tower on the gazebo. The garage reno is awkward, i.e., the notch needs to be reworked and tied in with the house.

Summary of Panel's Comments:

Consensus re: the project - No to a flat covered roof over the gazebo; Prefer stone terrace to a wooden deck. Garage needs to be refined.

Motion: To support with comments addressed. Moved and Seconded: Carried unanimously.

Address: 1288 The Crescent
Inquirer: John Keen, Farpoint Architectural Inc.
Description: To consider the proposed landscape and design of a new house with below-grade parking. This is the second inquiry regarding the new house and landscape, and the fourth regarding this site.
Inquiry: Fourth

Architects Presentation:

Mission Style: the issue of too many Mission styles in the First Shaughnessy was discussed. It was pointed out that this style is within the First Shaughnessy guidelines. It was also pointed out by the architect that the house being built at the corner of South Granville reads in his mind as “Italianate” not “Mission.”

Porte-cochere: the moving of the porte-cochere back 52 feet from the closest property line and 68 feet from the curb.

Tower Height: It was noted that the neighbouring houses are presently at 42.7 feet and 41 feet respectively. Thus, it doesn't seem unreasonable to ask for an increase of 5 feet to bring the height of this house to a total of 40 feet.

Parking: has been reduced from 8 stalls to stalls.

Exterior Colours: proposed exterior colours are crème and brown, i.e., described as being “muted and elegant.”

Landscape: Garden style is compatible with the house. Did research around Mission style gardens but couldn't find any comparisons. As a result of this, the landscape architect looked at Mediterranean and French styles with respect to: central axis, terraces, geometric, and formal vs. formal elements. Wanted to create a forest look that reflects the “pastoral style of First Shaughnessy.” Two reflecting pools remain but they have been altered to read as more asymmetrical.

Panel Questions:

- Has the porte-cochere been moved back? Yes.
- What are your environmental initiatives on this project? Geo-thermal, hiring of an environmental consultant at some stage.
- What is the reason for the reflecting pools? Owner's spiritual beliefs.

Planning Comments:

Looking for comments on the proposed landscape, architecture and height of tower.

Panel Comments:

Placement of porte-cochere is greatly improved. Increase the height of tower. Like the beautiful, varied, pastoral landscape. It is nicely resolved. Concern re: the need to having parking for 7 cars. Wonderful. Nice Rendering. Porte-cochere is fighting for part of the house, i.e., differentiate it from the rest of the house. Roof slopes need to be unified. It actually has a garden! What about the reflecting pools becoming water passing under the stairs? The water feature in front needs to be connected. There is conflict between the upper and lower terrace. The front façade works well. Seeing neighbours' elevations was helpful. Two reflecting pools at front remain problematic. A medieval bridge was suggested to replace them. Greatly elongate the rear reflecting pool to mirror more of a Versailles' look. It would also create a more intimate relationship between the back terrace and the rear garden. Issue of environmental initiatives needs to be addressed, i.e., issue of geo-thermal not considered exotic anymore. You need to add more whimsy to the Mission style. Exterior colours are appropriate. Rear water feature is nice. Interior reads as dark. The reflecting ponds at the front remain problematic.

Motion: to support with comments addressed. Moved and Seconded: Carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 7 p.m.