



CITY OF VANCOUVER
Community Services Group
Current Planning

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

Minutes of the Meeting of September 21st, 2006

Present:

Beth Noble, Vice-Chair	Resident - SHPOA Member
Kilby Gibson	Resident Member at Large
Kathy Reichert	Resident Member at Large
Barbara Campney	Resident Member at Large
Michael Roburn	Resident - SHPOA Member
Carole Walker Angus	Resident - SHPOA Member
Maureen Molaro	Resident - SHPOA Member
Stewart McIntosh	BCSLA
Michelle McMaster	BCSLA
Steve Palmier	AIBC
Richard Keate	Heritage Commission Representative
Judy Ross	Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver

Regrets/Absences: Derek Neale AIBC

Recording Secretary: Margot Keate West

City Staff: Sailen Black, Development Planner, UDDPC

AGENDA

- I. 4:00 **Business:**
1. Review of the Minutes of August 10 and 31, 2006
 2. Projects Update
- II. 4:15 **Address:** 1576 W. 16th Avenue
- Architect: Kim Johnston, Johnston Davidson
- Landscape: Refer to previous package (unchanged)
- Description: Addition to a single-family dwelling
- Application Review: Second

I. Business

1. **Minutes of August 10th, 2006** were reviewed, and were approved as presented
Moved, Michelle. Carried unanimously.

Minutes of August 31st, 2006 were reviewed, and were approved as presented
Moved, Kathy . Carried unanimously.

2. **Projects Update**

- **New Building Material:**
- Director of Planning has asked for the panel's opinion on how to achieve the look of true divided leaded windows with modern double glazing. Three options were presented. Option 1 is a double glazed unit with lead bars applied to the exterior (thick, with soldered joints). Option 2 is the same but with internal spacer bars between the two layers of glazing. Option 3 is like option 2 with an additional set of interior lead canes added. For new dp's (new construction) the director of planning would accept option 2, with the option that the applicant upgrade to option 3 if they so desire. For retrofits to existing structures, option 3 would be acceptable. Option 1 is not acceptable in any application.
- The panel supports the director of planning's current position.
- **Absences:**
- The panel discussed the issue of minuting absences as either with a leave of absence or without, as the case may be. It was decided that this would take effect as the new policy. Panel members will email the chair with requests for leave of absence. These requests will be dealt with at the beginning of each meeting. This will bring the panel in line with the procedures of other City advisory committees.
- **Election of officers:**
- At the next meeting, there will be an election of chair and vice chair. It was noted that both of these positions must be held by a resident member of the panel.
- **Onsite meetings:**
- The issue of site visits where official discussions are held was raised. If meetings are held before 4:00 pm it is difficult for some members to attend. Conversely, if site visits are held starting at 4, the meetings tend to run later. The conclusion was that any official discussion should occur during the regular meeting, so that those who have to visit the site on their own time can participate in the discussion. However, if an agenda is short, site visits can begin at 4:00 pm, with the regular meeting to follow.
- **3738 Hudson**
- This pre-WWI character house is currently for sale, and the panel has been asked to review its merit, and whether or not retention will be required by the panel.
- **Motion:** The panel finds the pre-WWI house at 3738 Hudson St. meritorious and worthy of retention.
Moved: Maureen; **Seconded:** Richard; **10 in favour, one against.**

Address: 1576 W. 16th Avenue
Architect: Kim Johnston, Johnston Davidson
Description: Addition to a single-family dwelling
Application Review: Second

Program:

Changes to architecture: Front landscape wall will be higher and more detailed. It will be punctuated with landscape elements like the fence of the neighbouring house at Fir and 16th Avenue. The fence is to be faced with ground polished concrete block. A sample was passed for panel consideration. A setback detail for the gate area was provided, and will give presence to the entry. The gate will be iron with opaque glass behind (tempered glass with film).

Walkway and pathway to west of site: stairs have been removed with more patio space and grills around the trees to prevent damage to roots.

Patio courtyard has been enlarged and stairs have moved. Windows have been increased at lower level, and upper windows have been moved to southern side to look down at garden instead of at neighbour.

Archway on front façade will be squared off to look more contemporary. Railings at side door will match new fence and gate.

Panel Questions:

- Storm water retention calculations are accurate? No, reflect previous plan. Will likely increase with changes to plan.
- Pavers ? permeable where possible.
- Planting materials? As detailed on original scheme
- Main entry is in middle of front façade? Yes. Roof over side entrance will be retained, but stairs and landing will be removed, and entrance sealed off. This is necessary to maintain access to lower level.
- Fence - will wrought iron be like neighbours or go to ground? Go to ground
- Will fences butt up against each other? Currently yes, but openings could be reorganized to start with an opening so that the fences don't meet.
- Metal grating around trees? Removable, but there to allow water to trees without burying trees roots under 2 feet of soil. Adjacent walkway is higher than grade at which trees are planted.
- Planting will remain? Yes, existing planting will be retained where possible. Leaning tree will retained if feasible.

Planning Comments:

Planning wishes the Panel to comment on the following three points:

1. General: Whether previous concerns have been addressed in this presentation;
2. Front Wall: Noting:
 - (a) Guideline's description of typical front wall as stone in material,
 - (b) Use of wall material next door is granite, and
 - (c) ODP principle that development create an enclosure around property through landscape, stone or rock walls;
3. Grade Changes: Especially around existing mature trees.

Panel Comments:

Applicant is to be commended for addressing panel's previous concerns. Comments have been considered and addressed.

Front wall might be fine with ground split faced concrete, but would be better in granite. Fence would be better in granite with similar horizontal banding to neighbours. Concrete material is not in keeping with FSD and ODP. Granite facing on fence would be a nice gesture to the neighbour. New material might date poorly. Stone wall would add to neighbourhood. Gate and wall insets need to be identical in detailing (pattern of wrought iron). Fence can be distinct - should be granite, but perhaps in a different finish (smooth vs. ashlar) or in different pattern. Nice idea to have fence start with a planting element adjacent to neighbour's fence. Laminated glass in gate sounds unfortunate. Glass in gate might be prone to vandalism. Longevity of these materials is of concern.

Grade changes are pleasant, nice design feature. Grading around trees is of concern. Arbourist needed to establish how far retaining walls should be from trees. Needs to be a tree expert involved. In rear, storm water retention tank would be better towards west so the neighbouring trees are protected as much as possible.

Perhaps grading around trees or retaining wall could reflect the canopy of the trees above. Doesn't need to be so rigid. Like idea of grating over tree roots, if okayed by arbourist. Japanese in feeling.

Side porch needs infilling so that it doesn't look out of place - landscaping etc. would do. Porch detail (arch) still isn't effective. Better for whole thing to be removed or filled in. Wall should extend all the way up. Edge of house needs to be defined. Gable extension that protrudes beyond east wall of house would be better either infilled if it can't be removed. Boxed soffit needs to go. Delete porch.

West patio is bleak, and needs greenery. The panel has some concerns about stairs in sunken patio.

Motion: To support with comments addressed. **Moved:** Richard; **seconded:** Michelle; **carried** unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 5:25

Q:\Clerical\UDDPC\06FSADP\06minutesfsadp\06.09.21.fsadp.mins.doc

Approved with ? changes noted