

City of vancouver Community Services Group Current Planning

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

Minutes of the Meeting of November 2, 2006

Present:	Beth Noble, Vice-Chair Kilby Gibson Kathy Reichert Barbara Campney Michael Roburn Carole Walker Angus Maureen Molaro Michelle McMaster Steve Palmier Derek Neale	Resident - SHPOA Member Resident Member at Large Resident Member at Large Resident Member at Large Resident - SHPOA Member Resident - SHPOA Member BCSLA AIBC AIBC
Regrets/Absences:	Stewart McIntosh Judy Ross Richard Keate	BCSLA * Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver * 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 September 21 & October 12, 2006

- 2. Recent Projects Update
 - 1402 McRae Avenue
 - 1990 West 18th Avenue
 - 1628 Marpole Avenue
- 3. 2007 Dates for FSAD Panel Meetings

Address: 1609 Cedar Crescent
Applicant: Pacific Image Home Designs (Ron van der Eerden)
Description: Construction of a single family residence on the vacant east portion of this subdivided triangular site.
Enquiry: Second

Address:**1589 Matthews Avenue**Applicant:Pacific Architectural Inc. (Eric Chung)Description:Renovation of this pre-1949 house, including replacement of leaded windowsEnquiry:First

Busi ness

1. Election of officers

Nominations:

For the position of chair Kilby Gibson nominated Beth Noble; seconded by Maureen Molaro. Carried unanimously.

For the position of vice chair, Kilby Gibson nominated Kathy Reichart; Seconded by Maureen Molaro. Carried unanimously.

2. Minutes of Sept 21st, 2006 - Kilby Gibson, and Kathy Reichart were present.

Motion to accept minutes of Sept. 21st with changes noted. Moved by Maureen, carried unanimously

Minutes of Oct. 12nd, 2006 - Kilby Gibson, Judy Ross, and Kathy Reichart were present, Beth was acting chair.

Motion to accept minutes of Oct 12th with changes noted. Moved by Kathy, carried unanimously

3. Recent projects updates:

a) 1402 McRae Avenue

Next meeting is Nov. 8th from 3:0 to 5:00 with a site visit, followed by a meeting at Hycroft. Anyone who is interested is encouraged to attend these meetings.

b) 1990 West 18th Avenue

Staff reviewed request from FSAD Panel to have the owner consent to enquiries: whether retention would be required for a pre-date house or whether demolition would be permitted but the City must field these questions, regardless of their source. If the FSAD Panel chooses, they can leave this comment up to staff. The city has been contacted by two architects who are considering retention and rehabilitation of the house for their clients.

Motion: The panel is not prepared to pass comment on these requests unless a written enquiry comes from, or is approved by the owner. Moved: Maureen; seconded by Michelle; carried unanimously

c) 1628 and 1648 Marpole Avenue

Fence runs down the middle of a property that was subdivided under an HRA. The existing fence was erected without a permit. The owners will be coming forward with a new fence design, although the HRA stipulated that there should not be a division down the middle of this property.

4. Meeting Dates for 2007

Beginning the First, Second or Third Thursday. The Panel decided that the second Thursday was preferable as a start date.

Address:	1609 Cedar Crescent
Applicant:	Pacific Image Home Designs (Ron van der Eerden)
Landscape:	Lena Heropic, Viewpoint Landscape Architects
Description:	Construction of a single family residence on the vacant east portion of this triangular site.
Application:	Second review

Changes to the Architecture: Comments about the prominence of the main entry in relation to other elements have been addressed. Added stone facing that defines entry portal more strongly. Raised archway and door. Two elements competing with front door have been toned down - window over front door has been reduced and archway has been removed. Reduced height of French doors (towards east), adding a transom level above doors. Fibre-crown moulding has been mostly eliminated- retained only on the chimney caps. Stucco has been changed in texture; plaster type stucco with hand trowelled effect. Detailing has been softened and toned down. Dentil work added under eaves. Roof has been changed from asphalt to concrete roof tile. Basalt ledge stone base will extend most of the way around the house. Isn't visible around garage, in order to subdue look of garage and due to grade issues. Trim colour has been added around windows and at eaves. True divided lights. More consistent divisions in the fenestration. Balcony between dormers on North elevation has been recessed and is lower in profile. A rendering was passed from the Robert Stern house book - referring to the balconies. Comments about removing lower stairwell windows was considered and rejected . Existing wall might make an appropriate place for an arbour, but is on city property, and may not be acceptable to the city. Windows on North elevation are longer and window boxes have been added. Garage door colour is now body colour of house.

Changes to Landscape: Existing brick wall will be retained, some existing trees will be retained. Diseased trees will be removed. Existing drainage problem means that sunken portions of the site have flooded, and plant material is diseased or dead. Separate vehicle and pedestrian entry. Arbour idea was explored, but rejected due to city property issue. Formalized pedestrian entry. A planting bed has been introduced to define entry. Helps to screen driveway from street. Generous lawn at back. Main activity is oriented to quieter street. Tall hedge planned for 16th street side. Turnaround has been kept, but Grass-crete pavers will be used. Step up introduced to main entry. Defines entry space, reinforces prominence. Retain as many shrubs as possible. Selective pruning removal and replacement. Reduced size of patio to left of front door. Paving has been reduced. Material will be tumbled concrete roman pavers. Basalt stepping stones will complement base of house.

Panel Questions:

- How will roof be held in place? Strapping is affixed to joists, and tiles sit on top.
- Grass-crete can be hazardous for those who are unsteady on their feet. Has Grasspave been considered? Either would be possible.
- Drainage is a problem? An engineer has been engaged for the drainage.
- Stone work around door is same as base? Yes.
- North elevation? Small window? Over kitchen counter. Two other windows could be adjusted to match.
- Storm water retention tank? Hasn't been designed yet. Hopefully under side lawn.

Planning Comments:

• Planning would like to recognize the obvious and substantial improvement in quality of materials chosen. Moving nicely towards FSD standards as envisioned by Panel and ODP. Detailed design of storm water retention centre needs to be resolved through mechanical engineer to the satisfaction of the Sewers Branch.

Questions to Panel:

- Our current understanding of the Panel's take is that massing, floor plan, siting and access have been accepted and no further changes on this scale are sought, is that correct?
- Has the new window composition presented today resolved earlier panel comments? Our next steps would be to continue with design development on the cladding and exterior, so we need your direction on whether:
- 1. Any remaining features of the design require revision, e.g. balcony, landscape, entry
 - 2. Materials presented today are endorsed, e.g. split grey basalt, fibre-crown chimney
 - 3. Are there any other areas requiring further development.

Page 4 of 5

Panel Comments:

The FSAD Panel wishes to thank the applicant for addressing the comments so thoroughly. Happy that you've addressed most of the comments so well. Appreciate the work that you've gone to. Clear, thorough presentation. Only concerned with detail at this point. Raising 2 windows on North elevation would help to simplify. Repetition and rhythm shown in stern rendering are good. South elevation could be more rigorous. Dormers would benefit from uniformity. Remove lower windows in staircase. Help entrance to be more prominent. More steps at entrance would help with presence. Stone could return around garage as well. Would tie it to house. Garage stands alone and has its own presence. Would benefit from being tied into architecture. Nice materials, Like new materials. Basalt is nice with colours chosen. Detail of railings, stone etc. is good. Entry is much better, given that it is set back. Could fibre-crown be removed from chimney caps? Transoms over doors are nice. North elevation would be better with lower windows shortened to match kitchen. Materials are good. Recognize limitations of site, but garage is too prominent. Forecourt to front door would help to detract from garage. Dormers would be better without introduction of curved roof element. Like symmetry of windows on North. More attention to front door would be better. Entry is too flat looking. Lighting may help. Patio area is better reduced. Stairwell window on front is problematic. Complement designer for changes, much better scheme. Rational re: stonework around base makes sense. Trim (stringcourse) around garage is good. Flashing details will change if mandatory rain-screening comes into effect for single family before this is built. Stone base doesn't wrap around east elevation well.

Landscape: Grasspave or similar is good solution. Walkway main entry is set apart, which is good. Adjustments to other paved areas are good. Introduction of basalt into landscape is nice. Look into Grasspave product rather than Grass-crete. Could shape of turnaround be changed to look less obviously like a turnaround.

Landscape Architect's Comments: Shape of turnaround has been kept to the minimum. Edges will be softened with planting.

Architect's Comments: Level of stone base is dictated by grade. Struggled with stone wrapping around garage, no obvious answer. No stone seems to be better. More stairs to front door would have to be created with landscaping. Prominent lanterns on either side of door are indicatec (not well represented by rendering)

- Motion: To support the relaxation of the front yard setback (as presented) on this site. Moved: Kilby; seconded by: Michelle; carried unanimously.
- Motion: To support this project as presented with comments addressed. Moved: Maureen; seconded: Michelle; carried unanimously.

First

leaded windows

Address:	1589 Matthews Avenue
Applicant:	Pacific Architectural Inc. ,Eric Chung
Description:	Renovation of this pre-1949 house, including replacement of

Architecture: Renovation primarily to the interior of this house. Proposing to replace original leaded windows and possibly some of surrounding walls. Porch to be added at back. Add granite and iron fence, paver driveway. Window treatment: client wanted plain windows. Leaded glass treatment will be revamped with double glazed version. Existing fenestration includes leaded Diamond pattern in some areas (original), leaded rectangular pattern elsewhere (later addition). A wing was added 10 years ago, with double paned diamond pattern leaded window. Driveway to be in granite composite (ground down and re-formed into bricks or tiles). Advantage would be in patterning. A sample and proposed pattern will be brought to next meeting.

Panel Questions:

Enquiry:

- Design rationale reference for rear porch? Heavy detailing, similar to recommended tudor detailing (picture shown, Brenchley house on Granville St.) skylights will be used on roof of porch to allow light though, although skylights are concealed by pediment.
- North elevation, how far back from edge of roof will skylight be? Set far back
- What will it be clad with? Brown aluminum.
- Are original windows going to be retained? No, client Intends to replicate the pattern of the main foyer and staircase windows and choose a new pattern for all other windows (to be double glazed, leaded on the outside with spacer bars)
- Are metal framed windows going to be replaced with wood? Yes all will be consistent, new wood windows with new patterning.
- Original Diamond patterning will be replaced with new rectangular pattern with dot? Yes.
- Glass block on floor of porch? To allow light to penetrate through to basement.

Planning Comments: Two issues for the Panel, planning is seeking comments on the rear addition in general, and comments on the windows:

- does Panel recommend keeping appearance of small divided lights; and
- if so, does Panel support current Director of Planning approach to simulating divided lights.

Panel Comments:

The FSAD Panel feels strongly that these original windows should be retained in situ. These can be reused in a number of ways to achieve current standards. Back porch is coming along just fine and will fit in nicely. Skylights are fine. Brenchley house is a good example of detailing. Concern for windows is very strong. Happy that owner is going to repair this house. Would be helpful to be discussing windows in context of the whole house. More detail needed. Original windows are very important to this architecture and should be retained. More substantial porch would be great. The Director of Planning's current approach to replacing leaded windows would be the very minimum acceptable, although retention is far more desirable. Effect of original windows cannot be replicated. These windows need to be treated very carefully. Replacement of newer (rectangular) windows that aren't true divided isn't a problem, but all original windows should be retained where possible.

Architect's Comments: General direction will be to retain original glazing, encased in new wood windows with second layer of glazing behind.

Recommendation: To have this return as an enquiry with comments addressed, and with sample materials, and larger scale drawings.

Adjourned at 6:30

Q:\Clerical\UDDPC\06FSADP\06minutesfsadp\11.02.fsadp.mins.doc