

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

Minutes of the Meeting of December 13, 2007

Present:	Beth Noble, Chair Kathy Reichert, Vice-Chair Kilby Gibson Carole Walker Angus David Cuan Lori Kozub Michelle McMaster Elisabeth Whitelaw Clinton Cuddington	Resident - SHPOA Member Resident Member at Large Resident Member at Large Resident - SHPOA Member Resident - SHPOA Member Resident - SHPOA Member BCSLA BCSLA AIBC
Regrets/Absences:	Joan Nesbitt Mamie Angus Judith Hansen Judy Ross Derek Neale	Resident Member at Large Resident Member at Large Heritage Commission Representative Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver AIBC
Recording Secretary:	Margot Keate West	
City Staff:	Sailen Black, Development Planner, UDDPC Vicki Potter, Rezoning Planner (Co-Manager Rezoning)	

AGENDA

Business:	1. Review of the Minutes of November 1 and November 22, 2007 2. Recent Projects Update
Address:	1898 West 16th Avenue
Inquirer:	Loy Leyland MAIBC, Loy Leyland Architect
Description:	To consider the proposed design of a new single-family house and garage.
Inquiry:	First
Address:	1288 The Crescent
Inquirer:	John Keen MAIBC, Farpoint Architectural
Description:	To review retention options as requested by Planning staff and to consider a preliminary design for a new house on this site.
Inquiry:	Second

Business

1. **Minutes of November 1, 2007** were reviewed. The members requested that it be noted that Kilby Gibson, Lori Kozub, Kathy Reichert and Carole Walker Angus voted against the McRae proposal at the last meeting (as they had requested at the time of the vote). Moved by Kilby Gibson; Seconded by Lori Kozub; Carried unanimously.

Minutes of November 22, 2007 were reviewed, and were approved as presented
Moved by Michelle McMaster; Carried unanimously.

The Chair and Lori Kozub urged panel members to review ODP and guidelines, as some recent decisions haven't reflected the intent of these.

The Chair welcomed David Cuan as new resident member.

Next meeting will be January 17th. A complete list of dates for the coming year will be circulated in the New Year.

2. Recent Projects Update:

1402 McRae - Development: Follow up from SHPOA meeting - Vicky & Sailen addressed SHPOA in regards to this proposal.

1947 West King Edward is in as an application and will be seen in January.

1056 Matthews Avenue was demolished for subdivision and is now for sale as two lots.

The members noted that it is frustrating to be asked for input that doesn't seem to count for anything (as in the case of the house recently demolished on Matthews Avenue.) It is unfortunate that the subdivision bylaw supersedes heritage and FSD planning/zoning.

Address: 1898 West 16th Avenue
Inquirer: Loy Leyland MAIBC, Loy Leyland Architect
Description: To consider the proposed design of a new single-family house and garage.
Inquiry: First

Proposal:

To demolish post-war split level house of little architectural merit. There exists a desire to keep the existing pattern of access with one access off of 16th Avenue, and one onto the rear lane. Proposed house is an L shaped plan with corner turret element and a half story built in to roof. Landscape architect has yet to be retained. Green/planted areas will be roughly as displayed. Materials include stucco, duroid (asphalt shingles), rock chimney and elements (columns, etc.) wood windows and trim.

Panel Questions:

- FSR? Allowable is 5600. 4600 above ground, 1000 below. Vaulted spaces in living room.
- Driveway exists? Yes
- Existing trees removed? 18 inch pine in back yard may come out.
- Perimeter treatment? Rock wall around north and west property lines.
- Why duroid? Not many choices. Cedar isn't favoured, synthetics aren't approvable. Slate is too expensive.
- Entryway walkway? Around 8 feet. It would be nice if Cypress Street side had an antechamber between front gate and house.
- Driveway right through? Engineering may not allow use of existing 16th Avenue cut.
- Buffer of landscaping between driveway and neighbour? 1 metre plus new fence.
- View from neighbours? Tall trees or direct view in to driveway? Direct view that will be buffered by planting.
- Height? 35 ft. plus architectural appurtenance.
- Flat roof? No, all sloping.
- Placement of neighbouring building? Not shown on drawing.

Planning Comments:

16th Avenue Cut: Excavating into required front yard is a problem, as well as access onto 16th Avenue.

Some concern about relative complexity of West facing (Cypress Street) façade. Entry feels close to sidewalk.

Panel Comments:

In regards to proximity to Cypress Street: There doesn't appear to be enough depth to allow for filtering and layering of landscaping. Perimeter landscape treatment needs to be addressed to allow for discrete sighting into property. West elevation is a bit busy with fenestration. Bank of windows to right of door looks cramped where it intersects with rotunda; more stucco in between would help. In support of access off of 16th Avenue. Design allows for 3 point turns so that access to 16th Avenue would be forwards rather than having to back out. Need materials board next time. Nice to see how palette ties in with design. (Planning apologized for not having brought material provided by applicant.)

Not in favour of driveway. Nice to have more vegetation to drown out sound. West elevation skirt roof will be very prominent aesthetically -not best place for duroid.

Landscape plan needs to be developed early and in conjunction with house design. Filtered look would be good. Front entry path looks very large. Very tight to street - layering will be difficult. Economy of space with driveway is fine, but important to consider neighbours sighting etc. Materials - huge roof visually. Interesting to see samples - some sort of quality material would be appropriate. Landscape design needed. Hard to envision without. North part of garden could be accessed where light well is. Not enough space for buffer planting

along east side. In terms of facades - entry seems fairly subdued. Agree with comment about fenestration looking squished against rotunda. Eyebrow dormer doesn't seem to work - doesn't relate to form of other dormer. North elevation is very symmetrical except for second window on lower floor. Visually disturbing. Removal of driveway from 16th would alleviate problems from neighbour's perspective.

Style isn't clear - pastiche of different bits. Needs to be refined, made more elegant and less complicated. Try and stretch to have highest possible quality of materials. Duroid doesn't work on a house with such a prominent roof. Turret detail isn't successful - feels squished at 35 ft. Original turrets were always higher, and since that's not possible it should be rethought. Main artery means that 16th Avenue cut should go. Simplify design. Entrance should be more grand, but hard to do with only 15 ft. Better to do without 16th Avenue (STREET) cut for safety and privacy issues. North Yard could be pleasant outdoor space. Front entry needs to be further from street. Turret makes sense from a functional perspective, but overall relationship between elements needs to be looked at again. Front entrance needs to be wider, grander. South wing has presence, driveway coming through will be the difficulty. Closing it off would be softer for landscape and neighbour. Schizophrenic windows. South dormer has no relation ship to North side. Looks like two different houses. Pick one. Like eyebrow. Busy roofline - turret is making the problem worse. Sunken areas seem excessive. Nice if turret could be higher in this case, as it would help overall design. 16th Avenue has almost no driveways.

Chair's Summary:

Majority of Panel not in favour of having 16th Avenue cut. Simplify design, facades seem complicated. Entryway feels too crowded.

This enquiry can proceed as an application.

Address: 1288 The Crescent
Inquirer: John Keen MAIBC, Farpoint Architectural
Description: To review retention options as requested by Planning staff and to consider a preliminary design for a new house on this site.
Inquiry: Second

Proposal:

To demolish existing pre-date house, and construct new single family dwelling. Heritage study supports demolition of house. Retention study undertaken and presented in package. Did the best to cover the range of plausible options. Desire is for single family residence. Option A1 adds FSR to existing house. More plausible is option A2 which consists of existing house with infill. This house doesn't conform with what would normally be required for infill (primary residence is usually required to be 6,500 sq. ft. plus). In this case, the existing house would be moved back with larger house built in front.

A3 eco-density option: 3 houses all of similar scale. Options A2 and A3 require a 6 meter fire lane to access all residences. Means that there is a lot of paving.

B study: Single family residence on site. Retention of more endearing parts of building which include the turret and living room with barrel vaulted ceiling. This portion of the house would be preserved as an accessory building (not a residence) on the site. The significance of this is that it's not a residence, ie. no fire lane issues. Adding 14000 sq. ft. to this building means the tail is wagging the dog. By reusing the turret and living room portion, it can be segregated from the main residence without influencing design.

Push pull of properties on Crescent - some are set forward, some are set back. In design of this new house, the setback of the existing house will be retained further back. Trying to keep footprint compact to allow for large garden. Lot has an oddity, in that 6500 sq. ft. of back garden was sold to neighbour facing 1203 Matthews Ave.

Style proposed is Spanish Mission Revival style. The owner wants to pursue authentic materials, and strict attention to detail.

Single family residence is worth 20 - 25% more to this owner than a multifamily project. There is a premium to the value in this type of property. All options present same FSR, but at varying cost of retention of the original building. Owner is willing to pay for retention of heritage as an accessory. If the building is to exist, the owner wants it to be as nice as possible.

Landscape:

Goal is to maintain as much open space as possible, to retain Shaughnessy scale. Huge row of existing trees will be retained. Large evergreens were lost at back last year's storm. There is an opportunity to plant an orchard at back. Owner wants to retain mature planting and scale or open spaces. Proposing a double entrance, with existing street cut on west side and new cut on east. 137 ft. frontage (100 required for circular drive in FSD). Street trees and trees on property are compatible with circular driveway proposal.

Panel Questions:

- Relaxations for accessory building? No, this is within allowable setbacks. Small enough that it's reasonable.
- Proximity of accessory building to neighbours? Nothing nearby.
- Garage under house for 8 cars. Seems like a superb opportunity to include a traditional coach house. Corner that's missing from property is on side with historic access. Trying

not to fill up garden with building. Owner is enthusiastic to have green space rather than more buildings or paving. Seems analogous to a folly.

- What is advantage of retaining this building? Because we're being asked to.
- In other options, would style of main house be different? Style of original is storybook cottage which is unsuitable for such a large house.
- Is the design panel married to the decision that a portion of this house be retained?

Planning Comments:

Comments on landscape and architecture proposed. Option presented is presented in this form to accommodate the comments of the Panel in relation to retention. Architect and owner have listened to advice of Panel, and have responded thusly.

Panel Comments:

Terrific report - gives an idea of how many options have been considered and to what depth. Leaning towards option B. Very big property, close to McRae. Retention of single family home is the most important thing. Like the teahouse folly. Whimsical, but not in the tradition of the neighbourhood. Lovely if owners are gardeners. In favour of retention as a teahouse. Some concerns about styling of proposed house - feels a bit over the top. Applicant should be commended. Investigations have convinced that retention of home is a disaster. Finally convinced that site can take new house. Not schizophrenic to retain older house of different style. Clever re-use of house. Most important issues is what's to come. Explosion of ideas at front. Could be something quite extraordinary. Owner has proven that they are willing to invest in neighbourhood. Portion of original could be used as gatehouse so that it's visible from front. Could be incorporated as a caretaker's house or a garage. Excited by this proposal. So often properties come up and FSD has changed for it. Feels like an old FSD property - estate. Really exciting to see. Nice to hear that client will spend money on materials, etc. Interesting solution to old house. Nice that something is anchoring bottom of property. An extravagance for retention, although nice to have luxury of memory. Completes project. Would have been interested in seeing coach house option (although not necessarily permissible?). Option that preserves intent is A1, in that house is visible from street, but not a successful option in other respects. Part B is acceptable. Don't feel that FSADP should require retention because it's not visible. Don't want to impose this on owner. Original house didn't have great merit, not important to retain it, even as a memory. Prefer to see coach house as an accessory building. Underground garages bulk up main building. Would be nice to have a few parking spaces pulled out of basement and used in a garage elsewhere on site. Folly feels like an insult - isn't needed if it isn't visible. Better to let original house go, and build a sympathetic coach house. Because of exhaustive presentation, it is clear that B is best option, but preserved part is marginalized and no longer effective. As the owner, I would want to build a folly that's a bit more exotic. Accessory building idea is valid, but isn't required to be reused. Floor plan could be flipped to accommodate. Efforts of applicants are much appreciated. Footprint of original house could be marked in floor/landscape of new building

Chair's Summary:

In favour of plan B. Lip service paid to retaining house, but Panel members felt that although it's to the letter of the law, it's not to the spirit of the law. Coach house should be considered. Praised exhaustive study.

Motion: To proceed as an inquiry.