

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

Minutes of the Meeting of May 1, 2008

No Quorum

Present: Kathy Reichert, Vice-Chair Resident Member at Large
Kilby Gibson Resident Member at Large
Joan Nesbitt Resident Member at Large
Mamie Angus Resident Member at Large
Carole Walker Angus Resident - SHPOA Member
David Cuan Resident - SHPOA Member
John Keen AIBC
Loy Leyland AIBC

Regrets/Absences: *Beth Noble, Chair Resident - SHPOA Member
*Lori Kozub Resident - SHPOA Member
*Michelle McMaster BCSLA
*Elisabeth Whitelaw BCSLA
Judy Ross Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver
Judith Hansen Heritage Commission Representative

Recording Secretary: Margot Keate West

City Staff: Sailen Black, Development Planner, UDDPC

AGENDA

Business: 1. Review of the Minutes of April 10, 2008
2. Projects Update

Address: 1438 Balfour Avenue
Inquirer: Stuart Howard, Stuart Howard Architects Inc.
Description: To consider a proposed change of roof material from cedar shingles to synthetic slate.
Enquiry: First

Business

1. **Approval of the minutes** of the previous meeting of April 10, 2008: The Panel postponed the approval of previous meeting's minutes until there is a quorum. These minutes should reflect that Kilby Gibson was present at the last meeting.

H:\Meeting Coordinators\Advisory Committees\FSADP\2008\minutes\080501.doc

There was a motion to approve agenda: Carole Walker Angus.

2. Recent projects update

- **1402 McRae Avenue:** Rezoning approved in principle by Council. Development permit to retain Nichol house is in progress.
- **1628 Marpole Avenue:** Permit to add the pool and cabana is nearing completion.
- **3537 Osler Street and 3885 Selkirk Avenue:** Nearing issuance pending some final steps by the architect or owner.
- **1864 West 19th Avenue:** Approved with minor conditions.

3. New business - 16th Avenue and Cypress Street:

Neighbours are worried about vagrants living in this house. It will only be demolished when the permits have been issued (likely 6 months from now). The city has the ability to vary this. The architect will pursue earlier demolition on the basis of safety with the city.

Address: **1438 Balfour Avenue**
 Inquirer: Stuart Howard, Stuart Howard Architects Inc.
 Description: To consider a proposed change of roof material from cedar shingles to synthetic slate.
 Enquiry: First

Proposal: To change roofing material from approved cedar shingle to 'synthetic slate'. The owners would like to use 'roofrock'. It has been used on a few projects in FSD, e.g. 16th Avenue and Cedar Crescent (at Fir Street) , and in the 1100 block of Matthews Avenue. Research shows that this is a sustainable product with large recycled content. Supposed to last forever. Cedar has a life of 20 to 30 years if treated with nasty chemicals (considerably less if not treated). The proposed product is appealing for green reasons as well as aesthetics. Architect supports this product change.

Panel Questions:

- Colour? Gunsmoke grey (not quite black). Same as house on Cedar Crescent, and Seaforth Armoury.
- Real slate considered? Yes, but cost is prohibitive as well as weight. House is engineered for cedar.
- Cost difference between this and cedar? Same or more for roofrock. Quality of cedar has dropped off. Long term cost of cedar is a problem.
- Maintenance issues? On south exposure in sunny spots there has been some cupping/ lifting of corners on other jobs. Particularly a problem with ebony colour-way. Approved for use in Southern California.
- Off-gassing? Not more than other composite materials
- Would this be a bad trend if this was to supplant real slate? No. Real slate will always be superior. Tried a number of other synthetic slate products: (Eternet - see Christ Church Cathedral) very brittle, breaks easily.
- How old is this product? A few years. Haven't seen it long term on any projects
- Discolouration? No, colour goes all the way through.
- Where is this made? Local - made in the valley. Environmental costs are low.
- Repel growth? Could be pressure washed. Wouldn't attract growth.
- Will hail etc. affect aesthetics? Behaves like real slate. Marks will come and go and patina over time.
- Application is similar to slate? Yes. Not difficult
- Why only 50 year warrantee? As long as any roofing material is guaranteed for. Will likely be around for much longer.
- Gutters? Could be Zinc
- Mitres? Manufacturer makes cap piece. Roof on this house is not hipped. Valley will be flashed like other roofs.
- Colour of house? Earth tones. Dark windows and trim. Subtle. This product is in keeping.
- Client wanted this because material will last longer? Yes. Presently own house with cedar shingles and aren't happy
- Colour cited on drawings is heritage brown? Incorrect - has been changed to grey.
- How will grey go with Knoxville grey of upper shingles in gables? Goes well. Nice contrast. Better than contrast between natural cedar shingles and painted below.

Planning Question:

Looking for FSAD Panel comments on the material proposed. Director of Planning has sent this change of materials request to the Panel for consideration partly because the material will be applied over an extensive area of the building, unlike decorative elements which are more limited.

Panel Comments:

Looked at houses in neighbourhood with real slate and this product. Real slate is more irregular than this product. This looks a bit uniform. This house has a massive roof and this won't do the house justice. Won't flow with cedar siding treatment. Inclination is to lean towards natural products, however cedar is not sustainable. Looking for a way to like this. Have to move away from natural materials that are hard on the environment. Nobody is going to be standing 6 ft. from this product - it

is to be seen at a distance. Like longevity, recycled content and reusability of this product. Willing to give it a chance. Go with this in this case. Want to see zinc gutters to balance quality out (better detailing). Synthetic products aren't traditionally accepted in FSD, but in this case we have to be flexible. Don't know what's going to happen in 15 years. However, cedar won't be better than this. Wish you luck with how it performs. In this case it's worth taking a progressive approach. Wood products aren't endearing the way they used to be. Zinc Gutter would be a great trade-off, and would make for a pretty elegant mix. We've come to the point where we have to start choosing these products for the right reasons. Other materials have to be top-notch. Want to be able to support this, so project as a whole has to be great so that the decision isn't criticized. Don't like to be cornered in terms of approving this for all other projects. Want the right to say no to the next project that wants this. Has to be approached case-by case until the product is proven. Roof is primarily one large plane on North and South elevations - not sure that this product would be first choice as it will be monotonous. Don't have problem with product necessarily, but doesn't feel appropriate for this project. Walked by Cedar Crescent and thought it was real slate. Aesthetically the product is appropriate when applied. Very suitable and environmentally supportable. Viewed other houses and they looked quite good. Improvement over some other choices that are allowable. Like to see authentic material used, but this is a reasonable compromise in this circumstance.

Summary: General feeling that current quality of cedar means that this is a reasonable alternative. Two people had some concerns over the size of the roof in this case and the product being uniform/monotonous. Two suggestions for zinc gutters. Another suggestion that other materials should be of a quality, and not be obviously synthetic.

General consensus that support or non-support for this type of product will be taken case by case.

Architect's Rebuttal : Originally very concerned about this product, but have come to be impressed with it and willing to support it. Understand the concern about the Panel's troubles in trying to control use of new products. Please note that Napa valley stone is already approved for the project; to be used for some trim pieces.

Panel members in support of this product with comments addressed in this particular application: 6 for, 2 against. (Carole Walker Angus wished to be noted as opposed)

Motion to Adjourn at 5:10

Why are we having motions and votes when there is no quorum?