

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

Minutes of the Meeting of November 23, 2006

Present: Beth Noble, 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
 Derek Neale AIBC
 Judy Ross Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver

Regrets/Absences: Richard Keate 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 November 2, 2006.
 2. Recent Projects Update

Address: **1589 Matthews Avenue**
Applicant: Eric Cheung, Pacific Architectural Inc.
Description: Interior and exterior alterations to this pre-1940's residence, including the landscaping.
Enquiry: Second

Address: **1990 West 18th Avenue**
Applicant: Howard Airey, Formwerks Homes Inc.
Description: Addition, alteration and complete renovation to this pre-1940's residence, including the landscaping.
Enquiry: First

Address: **3416 Cedar Crescent**
Applicant: Howard Airey, Formwerks Homes Inc.
Description: Construction of a single family residence with one car garage at the rear, new landscaping and 2-car garage below grade.
Application: First Review

Address: **1628 Marpole Avenue**
Applicant: Donna Chomichuk, Landscape Architect
Description: Proposal to divide the two lots of this former estate redeveloped under a Heritage Revitalization Agreement as referred to FSADP by the Vancouver Heritage Commission please see attached.
Enquiry: First

Address: **1337 Balfour Avenue**
Applicant: Shawn Blackwell, Blackwell Architecture
Description: Renovation predominantly to the garage of this post-1940's house.
Enquiry: First

I. Business

**1. Minutes of November 2, 2007 were reviewed, and were approved as presented
Moved by Michael Roburn; Seconded by Kilby Gibson; Carried unanimously.**

2. Recent Projects Update

- **1438 Balfour Avenue:** Stuart Howard has been retained as the new architect on this project.
- **1288 The Crescent:** A tree has fallen on the back of the house but hasn't harmed the structure. This house has been empty for 8 years and the last time it came before the Panel, they suggested to the owner that it be retained.
- **1668 Matthews Avenue:** The granite pillars at the front gate have been partially demolished by the new owners. The owners have been instructed to apply for a permit.

DRAFT

Address: 1589 Matthews Avenue
Applicant: Eric Cheung, Pacific Architectural Inc.
Landscape Architect: Van De Poll Landscape
Description: Interior and exterior alterations to this pre-1940's residence, including the landscaping.
Enquiry: Second

Changes to the Architecture:

Adding/changing timbering to add interest. Windows to be reused with new glazing added behind for insulation. Skylights have been removed on upper roof (to light interior washrooms). New dormer proposed for west elevation, stepped back from gable end to provide opportunity for clerestory light. At back, upper eaves will be extended out to deal with water. Currently, a gutter is installed at the floor plate level to collect runoff from above. Dormer added between peaks with fanlight to light stairwell and reduce water problems between gables. Garage door altered to read as two.

Changes to Landscape: Altered position of driveway, and proposed planting plan presented.

Panel Questions:

- Is front door original? Yes.
- North elevation, skylight - drawing seems incomplete. Is this a new shed roof dormer? Yes
- Roof plan? No, not yet
- West elevation roof plan is unclear? (picture shown to illustrate type of roof form)
- Existing garage? Yes, just new door
- Could we see a massing model with application? Possibly
- Second storey window on west elevation is new? Yes
- Will all windows be leaded? Yes
- Railings on front and back? Granite with a stainless steel handrail above. (not exactly as drawn); not sure if pickets will be necessary
- From basement looking towards back yard? Small enclosed garden room beneath porch with light coming from glass block above.
- New windows will be true divided? yes

Planning Comments:

Has revised design addressed concerns about porch, windows? Noting the new dormers etc. would Panel recommend proceeding to application in this form?

Panel Comments:

Thank you for considering our comments and addressing them. Photo needed for clarity in comparing existing condition and garage should be 2 doors with post between and horizontal emphasis of windows. General approach to porch is okay. Arches are a bit too curved. East elevation is fine. Demi-lune windows aren't right for this type of architecture. Diagonals are good, could use some more timbering on West elevation. Georgian demi-lune windows aren't right. The Panel wishes to compliment the architect for addressing so many of the Panels' previous concerns. There is information missing on the landscape plan. Model and roof plan needed to clarify new dormers. Roof plan would be very helpful. Flare in bottom of stairs at back was nice - would like to see that explored for next time. Not enough light for garden beneath the porch to succeed. Glass block inset in deck might look out of keeping with rest of house. Wrought iron (or similar look) rather than stainless steel for handrails would be better. Curved driveway is very nice. Curve a bit too tight next to stairs. Note about a pedestrian gate, but no sidewalk. Seems unresolved. More info needed re gates, interface with street/sidewalk. Roof plan needed. Massing model helpful. This has come a long way. Back is an improvement over existing. Uniformity is good, and is much better than what is there. Stainless railing should be replaced with more traditional material, more consistent with FSD. Happy with treatment of windows. Addition to west roof raises ridgepole on that side of house (from street). This is of concern. Roof of attached garage doesn't fit with house. Could be improved. Wrought iron would be an improvement over stainless railings. Roof is very confusing, and doesn't seem to work. Reduced landscape plans required with next submission.

Architect: Garage seems to be original. Only additions on file with city are 10 and 15 years old. Garage pre-dates this and is much older.

Motion: The Panel wishes to see this as an application with comments addressed, and with model and complete drawings provided.

Moved: M. McMaster, Seconded: S. McIntosh; Carried unanimously.

Address: 1990 West 18th Avenue
Applicant: Howard Airey, Formwerks Homes Inc.
Landscape Architect: Paul Sangha
Description: Addition, alteration and complete renovation to this pre-1940's residence, including the landscaping.
Enquiry: First

Architecture:

SE corner of 18th Avenue and Maple Street. House will be retained. 39 to 40 ft east sideyard. Existing stone wall on two street sides will be retained and fixed. Rehabilitate house. Addition on inside sideyard. Small addition off back for mudroom and back porch. House has good bones but needs to be gutted. Stone foundation will be kept if possible. Two storey library will be housed in the addition. Small porch at rear. Sides are not articulated at all (original house plan was meant for 60 ft. lot, not 100). New bays will be added to Maple St. side (two on second story, one on main floor). New addition will be lower and set back. Existing trees and landscape are in terrible shape; a lot of new planting will be required. Beautiful elm trees on both boulevards will stay. Stuccoed over but original shingles and siding are underneath. Proposed colours would be dark brown with cream trim (sympathetic colour scheme for this style and era of house). Ironwork will be added to landscape. There might be a setback issue (only 1 ft.) in back yard. No height or FSR issues.

Panel Questions:

- Does garage meet setback? Yes
- Basement? 7 ft. 6 in. Going to try to excavate it from inside. May have to create some crawlspaces to meet FSR.
- Historical precedents for rounded sleeping porch? Quite common in this period of house.
- Are there setback requirements for pool? No
- Water retention? Yes, this will be addressed.
- Colour of shingles? Dark brown with cream trim
- Height of wrought iron on wall? Not high. Yew or laurel hedge behind for layering and more height.
- East elevation? Long windows? Not slavishly historical. Indicates that this is new and a two storey space.
- Ensuite rounded window? Pulled out over existing sleeping porch.
- Three car garage? Yes, with fireplace on exterior for outdoor use. Poolroom will be in basement

Planning Comments:

Commend applicant for retention of this pre- 1940's house. Planning would like to know if the Panel would like to see this as an application.

Panel Comments:

Wonderful, keep going. Nice plan. Thrilled that you're keeping the house. Maple Street elevation is a great improvement. If master bathroom window above front door was recessed a foot (rather than being flush) it would help. Shadows would help depth. Tripartite with stone, horizontal siding and shingles above. Would be nicer to access garden from kitchen or breakfast room rather than having to go through covered porch.

Motion: To proceed to application for the renovation of this pre 1940 house.

Moved: Beth Noble; Seconded: Kilby Gibson; Carried unanimously.

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

Address: **3416 Cedar Crescent**
Applicant: Howard Airey, Formwerks Homes Inc.
Description: Construction of a single family residence with one car garage at the rear, new landscaping and 2-car garage below grade.
Application: First Review

Changes to Architecture:

Single car garage off lane with small covered terrace/porch. Two car garage under house. All gravel for driveways (sound and permeability). Poolhouse/studio has been eliminated. Front entry has been altered. House is narrower. Simple Georgian painted brick house. Small terrace at dormer; reduces size of dormer.

Panel Questions:

- Any relaxations? No
- Storm water retention? Already engineered
- What is drop from driveway down to garage? Shallow enough to use gravel. Graduates down from circular driveway. Approx 10 percent slope.
- Water? Trench drain across front of garage door. Gravity fed to storm water tank.
- Elevated garage? Lane is 3 feet higher than yard. Elevated garage will be obscured with planting
- No lawn? Pool may not be built.
- Flat roof is necessary? Yes, we'd be over 35 feet. Slope is 8/12
- Driveway pullout leading to pedestrian gate? For dropping off groceries and turn around.
- Stairs leading from back yard down to garage? Landscaped to look more like a pathway than a stair.
- Garage has a chimney? Services the outdoor fireplace
- Powder room built if no pool? No it would be eliminated
- Paving around pool? Maybe only around two sides (if it gets planted)
- Painted brick, why not light coloured brick? Too commercial looking.

Planning Comments:

Planning wishes the Panel to comment on the effect of the driveway on sideyard planting and about the extent of non-planted area.

Panel Comments:

Eaves are nicely proportioned. Dormer seems too large for its window. Should be scaled back. Garage likewise. Eaves should be 2 ft. or 1 ft. 8 in. Site coverage seems quite large. Flat roof can't be adjusted? Amount of impermeable area is high. Beautiful house. Long deck on east side, and flat roof could present water problems. Heavy in paved/ unplanted surfaces. Turnaround/pullout could be reduced. Between garage and house patio could be reduced. Between pool and driveway - proximity of stair to pool seems too tight. More level area needed. Side yard screening on south side is of concern - needs more trees. Metalwork detailing is lacking, sort of pedestrian looking. Improvement over what's there. Bell cast eaves are great. Dormer window is too small. Play down garage chimney. Gravel drive is nice. More grass would be nice. Important to get wrought iron right. Garden needs more personality. Too much hard surface. Overall scheme is very successful. Might be more neighbourly if garage were on other side.

Motion: To support as presented with comments addressed.

Moved: Derek Neale; Seconded: Judy Ross; Carried unanimously.

Address: 1628 Marpole Avenue
Applicant: Donna Chomichuk, Landscape Architect
Description: Proposal to divide the two lots of this former estate redeveloped under a Heritage Revitalization Agreement as referred to FSADP by the Vancouver Heritage Commission please see attached.
Enquiry: First

Proposal:

This property has a lot of history. Came to FSADP 1996. Large parcel with large house at back of property for view reasons. Original driveway snaked across lot and wrapped around house. Principal door is located on west side. Subdivided into two freehold properties. Straight line of property line for good Feng Shui. This was the First HRA in Shaughnessy. HRA Included subdivision, retention of Austrian Consulate house, and addition of another house in side yard to look like a coach house. The two residences were meant to share an open front property. New lot was sold by developer after subdivision. Stipulations on landscaping were meant to maintain sightlines up to main house. Heavy Screening /planting in front of coach house was originally planned to make it recede and focus views on main house. Landscape on coach house side wasn't installed as approved. Gate was made wider Parking pad was added. In 2001 owner of 1628 Marpole (heritage house) added inexpensive cedar fence between the two residences. Owner compromised requirements of HRA shortly after occupancy and built a fence. It was specifically called out in HRA as needing to be an open common boundary. Current fence is an eyesore. Owner was reprimanded for being in contravention of HRA and an Encumbrance was placed on title of property.

2004 (December) - Current owners consulted City prior to purchase. Heritage Commission was consulted in regards to issuing a Heritage Alteration permit. VHC referred this to FSADP. Client is currently looking for input for design of fence, but wants to maintain security and privacy. Virtually no back yard, house is located at back. Lot is 19683 sq ft. Most is in front yard. Small children. Would like to be able to use front yard. Owner wishes to replace the current fence with lower fence and planting.

First option is to include non-climbable mesh panels in fence. Wood frame would be stained dark (to make it recede). Other option is to pursue an open board fence. Shape could be staggered rather than straight in order to provide staggered planting and soften appearance.

Removing fence won't restore original concept, as planting was not completed on either lot according to the approved

Heritage Planning Comments:

HRA was written 10 years ago and was the first HRA in FSD. HRA was required because there wasn't enough frontage to subdivide for an infill. Commission has deferred to FSADP. They are comfortable that delineation will not be detrimental to heritage. Given, this, the HRA must be amended to remove clause referring to the shared property line.

Does Panel feel that delineation is acceptable? What should the design look like if it is acceptable? Now is an opportunity with motivated owners, to look at intentions of original HRA and requirements within the First Shaughnessy District Design Guidelines.

Panel Questions:

- Was there any financial burden for owner who erected fence? No, no bond on HRA
- Wording of HRA referring to Director of Planning's ability to approve changes? Not intended to deal with wholesale change, rather minor tweaks only.
- This subdivision was approved with HRA and DP? Yes
- How was the subdivided property sold without installing landscaping on 1628 property? Don't know. Owners are often given 6 months to install landscaping. They were supposed to have done it, and didn't. Enforcement problem.
- Landscaping around fence is on 1638 side - will there be an agreement with neighbours? Don't know. City of Vancouver isn't involved with agreements between owners. This design includes neighbouring property. Owners will have to discuss with them when an approved direction has been decided upon.
- Do we have an opportunity to discuss 1638 property? Not really, doesn't fall within context of HRA. It is in contravention of its own DP, but not the HRA.
- Have owners considered fencing closer to house? No. Steeply sloping lawn at the moment.
- Has hedging been considered? Overall design intent is to have fence sit within planting (both sides) 3 to 6 feet in height, to make it softer.

- Have you considered a lower fence? Minimum height at 4 feet. Because of future desire to add a pool. Minimum height around pool is 4 ft.
- If this were a new project, heritage planning probably wouldn't ask for a restriction of landscaping along the shared property line. By removing this clause, heritage house stays protected, but incumbrance will be removed from HRA. Stronger of 'sticks' to enforce HRA was on title of 1628. Departures from the HRA also occur on 1638 Marpole Avenue. This process didn't work for this idea.
- Have you thought of using wrought iron? Yes, but liked character of wood better with tudor house.
- Could other HRA homeowners come to the pPnel for this kind of amendment? Yes, but it wouldn't necessarily be approved. This will not set precedence for other projects. HRA's are evaluated individually.
- Stone wall or hedge considered? No, because it offers less sense of flow, and softness.

Comments:

Commend owners for coming forward and dealing with this. Possibility of setting precedent for amending HRA's is worrisome. If this was in recent contravention, it would be in the City's interest to pursue this vehemently. But this problem wasn't created by the current owners, it isn't reasonable to hold these owners to it. The Panel wishes to thank the current owners for trying to resolve title issue, to the benefit of heritage. 1638 spoils estate like character of whole site. Clause should be removed, given time gone by and number of owners. Request to enclose space is valid. There needs to be a mechanism to look at how this HRA failed for the second property. So much was dependant on following through with their design; in retrospect it is unfair for heritage property to be stuck with heavier burden. The property shouldn't have been subdivided. The Panel is disappointed that HRA didn't uphold original intention. Can't hold current owners responsible for what should have been, and was never built. New perspective is needed, and sightlines should prevail. City needs to enforce HRAs better - very awkward for Panel to undo the original idea. Some members would like to uphold the HRA as written. Some feel that clause should be removed from HRA, although precedent is scary. City needs to uphold contracts better, enforce HRAs. Ill-conceived in its original form. Subdivision is the root of the problem. Wrong form of tenure to have a common landscape maintained by two owners. More fencing is contrary for FSD. Many issues stipulated in HRA were never enforced or executed - very disturbing. In favour of removing clause in HRA. Preference would be to see a small fence and hedging. Would be nice to see a very transparent fence with foliage to soften it. Proposed design is not visually porous enough. Metal would be better. Hedge would be another one of the terrace lines, and wouldn't read as a separate any more than what's already there. Lots of levels already. Don't like mesh fence - doesn't speak to heritage house at all. Needs to look permanent, and be softened by planting. Prefer wood to mesh. Fence won't impair view of original house. Of the two proposals, wood is better, but greenery (hedging) would be better. Prefer green, with invisible fence imbedded. If this is a neighbourly fence, it should be shared between owners, and burden of maintenance should be shared. Planting is much more important than fence. We should be talking about landscaping concept rather than fence. Not in favour of fence designs presented. Hedge would be better. What ever is done should be maintained by both neighbours.

Motion: To support the removal of the clause pertaining to the delineation of property through fencing, structures or planting in the HRA on the title of 1628 Marpole Avenue.

Moved: Derek Neale; Seconded: Kilby Gibson. Vote: 8 in favour; 3 opposed.

Motion: Non-support for the proposed design as presented today.

Moved: Beth Noble; Seconded: Maureen Molaro; Vote: 9 in favour, 2 opposed.

Address: 1337 Balfour Avenue
 Applicant: Shawn Blackwell, Blackwell Architecture
 Description: Renovation predominantly to the garage of this post-1940's house.
 Enquiry: First

Proposal:

Renovation to garage of existing house. Owners didn't like approach, or insignificance of entrance. Prominent view from street is currently the garage and carport. Use existing garage, repositioned, relocate existing man-gate, create more formal entrance to house and property. Renovate garage to reflect the building and character of the neighbourhood. Trying to leave main house in tact. Central entry porch has been added. Landscaping would be retained and enhanced, particularly around entry gates. Reduce hard surface in front yard. Eliminate turnaround, remove paving and replace with scored concrete.

Landscaping: Goal is to rejuvenate planting, screen house from street.

Panel Questions:

- Is this pre 1940? Guts of house is the original coach house of the H.R. MacMillan estate (corner of Hudson & Balfour), but relocated to the back of the property to allow for redevelopment of the lot towards Hudson (circa 1960's) and structure was gutted/stripped and rebuilt at this time.
- Garage is in front yard - considered tearing it down and moving it back? Pie-shaped lot means a double car garage wouldn't fit.
- Does application ask for relaxation of sideyard setback? Yes but it is currently non-conforming, this would be it's existing location. Request is to extend existing non-conforming garage another two feet where it would be in side yard setback.
- Connected to house? By open porch below and open deck above.
- Is there more hard surface, and can it be reduced? No change. Reduced in front yard.
- Relaxations? Just in side yard
- Is garage within front yard? No
- What are garage doors going to look like? Paneled with glazing above, custom painted wood door.
- Roof height of garage? Lower than main house by 3.5 feet. (total 24'8" from grade)
- Playroom above garage? Yes, playroom.
- Access to deck from guestroom/den and from main house? Yes. Existing sliding glass doors access small existing deck.
- Aluminum railing? Made to look like wrought iron, painted, but without rust issues.
- Trellis work will have some of the same detail.
- Concrete will be coloured? No. natural colour, but scored

Planning Comments:

Looking for Panel comments on general form of architecture and landscape proposed. Concern about exposure of garage on to front street.

Panel Comments:

Like relationship of proposed garage to house. Aluminum stands up well. Concern about driveway material. Prefer pavers, something softer. Prominent garage needs to be mitigated. Another driveway material would be good. Concern for exposure of garage to street. Planting might help. Don't like concrete driveway. Garage is very prominent. Nice garage doors, important that driveway be better considering prominence. Too much hard surface. Proposal will be an improvement. Much improved. Good for existing house and property. Talented young architect should be commended. Language of the details needs to be worked out. If garage were two feet back it would be even better (even if it means further relaxations). A lot of hard surface area needs to be toned down. Patio could be a permeable surface. Don't use concrete for driveway. Like relationship of garage to house, but don't like relationship between garage and street. Driveway isn't centred with garage. Initial reaction was that garage should move back, but it's not to the advantage of the scheme overall. Essentially doubling the width of the house. Paving materials need to separate pedestrian from vehicular. Paving needs to be better/softened. Better if garage was set back 3 ft. (to match patio doors on front of house). Garage doors are nice facing street. Look of connector between is nice, but frameless glass might be better replaced with aluminium railing.

Architect's Comments:

- Open to new driveway material. Exposure to street and prominence of garage - stuck with location as is, because of shape and setbacks.
- Street trees limit location of driveway entrance.

- Hard surface has been reduced from where it was. From front yard, paving is largely reduced.
- Front yard patio will be resurfaced, but not increased in size. Glass rail was meant to reduce prominence of bridge, and perceived height. Pulling garage 3 ft. back would be great, but side yard and right of way in side yard are restricting this. Garage can't be made narrower without going to single car garage.

Motion: That this proceed as an application with comments addressed.

Moved: Michelle McMaster; seconded: Beth Noble; Carried unanimously.

Motion: To see this again.

Moved by: Michelle McMaster; seconded by Kilby Gibson; Vote: 3 for, 8 against.

Meeting adjourned at 8:05 pm

Q:\Clerical\UDDPC\complete2006\06FSADP\06minutesfsadp\11 23 fsadp mins.doc

DRAFT