

# First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

## Minutes of the Meeting of March 12, 2009

A meeting of the was First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel held on Thursday, March 12, 2009, in Committee Room # 2 at Vancouver City Hall at 4:00 pm.

<b>Present:</b>	Kathy Reichert, Vice-Chair Mamie Angus Joan Nesbitt Carol Walker Angus David Cuan Michelle McMaster Elisabeth Whitelaw John Keen Loy Leyland	Resident Member at Large Resident Member at Large Resident Member at Large Resident - SHPOA Member Resident - SHPOA Member BCSLA BCSLA AIBC AIBC
<b>Regrets/Absences:</b>	Beth Noble, Chair Lori Kozub Kilby Gibson Judith Hansen Judy Ross	Resident - SHPOA Member Resident - SHPOA Member Resident Member at Large Heritage Commission Representative Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver
<b>Recording Secretary:</b>	David Cuan	Resident - SHPOA Member
<b>City Staff:</b>	Ann McLean Sailen Black	Development Planner, UDDPC Development Planner, UDDPC

## AGENDA

- Business:**
1. Review of the Minutes of November 27, 2008
  2. Projects Update
- Address:**
- |              |  |
|--------------|--|
| Address:     | <b>1230 Matthews Avenue</b>                                |
| Inquirer:    | Henriquez and Partners - Richard Henriquez, Don LaBossiere |
| Description: | To consider revisions to the proposed new dwelling.        |
| Status:      | DE412610 (Minor Amendment to DE403327)                     |
| Application: | First  |
- 
- |              |   |
|--------------|---|
| Address:     | <b>1450 McRae Avenue</b>  |
| Inquirer:    | Formwerks Architectural - Jim Bussey  |
| Description: | To consider the proposed design of new townhouses with underground parking. |
| Status:      | DE412659  |
| Application: | First   |

**Business:**

1. Kathy Reichert chairs this meeting as Beth Noble, the current chair, is absent.
2. Minutes Review: Minutes of March 12, 2009 were reviewed, and were approved as presented with the following revision: correct the misspelling of the name Carol Walker Angus in the minutes.

Moved by Carol Walker Angus; Seconded by David Cuan; Carried unanimously.

3. Panel Status: Ann McLean explained the current status of FSADP.
  - In anticipation of the election of the new Council, all advisory bodies including FSADP were dismissed.
  - FSADP was reactivated at the end of February this year.
  - New members of the panel will be appointed sometime in the month of May. Meanwhile, the previous members will serve as interim panel.
  - A new chair will be elected when the new panel members convene in May.
4. Projects Update:
  - No new applications received so far.
  - A couple of ongoing enquiries.

**New Business:**

**Address:** 1230 Matthews Avenue  
**Inquirer:** Henriquez and Partners - Richard Henriquez, Don LaBossiere  
**Description:** To consider revisions to the proposed new dwelling.  
**Status:** DE412610 (Minor Amendment to DE403327)  
**Application:** First

**Program:**

The architect presented the following:

The project is part of an HRA to rehabilitate the Rosemary estate. The project includes the restoration and relocation of the Lando House, the creation of a Guest House and a Main House fronting Matthews Avenue. This application is requesting minor amendments to the approved development for the design of the Main House and its relationship to its neighbours.

The architect pointed out the highlights of the proposed redesign of the Main House and its landscaping:

- Common vehicular access to the three lots remains the same.
- The Main House is on a higher base elevation than the adjacent Guest House/Garage to provide better natural light exposure to its garden.
- The proposed changes to the Main House do not deviate substantially from the original design principles.
- Proposed relocation of the existing Stable as a free standing structure, without the originally proposed enclosed link to the Main House
- The new lap pool is relocated out of the Stable. The current design shows the now totally outdoor pool traversing the Main House in a north/south fashion.

- The design of the main house is now simplified and made smaller by removing the turret element housing the elevator, the use of straight instead of curved stairs, deleting the originally proposed linkages to the Heritage Garden of the Lando House and to the Stable. Roof overhangs of the Main House are increased to provide better shading and to accentuate its triangular massing. These changes lessen the house impact as seen from Matthews Avenue.
- Window patterns are revised.
- Interior layout changes, including a transparent elevator area, the addition of a library and bathroom on the second floor and two decks on the second floor.
- Landscaping is reconfigured to address the proposed changes to the project including the proposed planting along the site's western boundary.
- Revise the gate to the northern access road from single to a double.

**Panel Questions:**

- Privacy issues between neighbours along the western property line? The neighbour present at this meeting is confident that this will be worked out between the owner of this site and him at a later date.
- Construction timeline? Planned for this summer.
- Is some of the roof overhangs glazed? Yes, the eastern ones are.
- Is the % of impermeable surfaces revised from the original proposal? No, the % is the same.

**Planner Comments:** Ann McLean reminds the panel to comment on the following specific revisions listed in the circular provided at the meeting:

- Deletion of the pedestrian bridge over the driveway linking the Main House to Heritage Garden;
- Deletion of the enclosed link from the Main House to the existing Stable;
- Relocation of the existing Stable;
- Relocation of the lap pool from the Stable to an exterior location;
- Revisions to roof and skylights;
- Increase to roof overhangs, especially the south;
- Addition of roof decks to the second floor;
- Amendments to the fenestration pattern, and addition of a "see through" elevator;
- Amendments to the landscape plan.

**Panel Comments:**

- The new building massing is more resolved; the new design is better.
- The contemporary design is a refreshing change.
- A strong project.
- A free standing Stable is an improvement.
- Removing the enclosed link between the Stable and Main House is an improvement.
- Concerns about the see through quality of the proposed elevator. Would like to see more landscaping/trees in front of this feature.
- Concerns about the large glazed roof overhangs.
- A slick looking building but not sure about the juxtaposition of this design with the adjacent traditional homes.

- Some concerns about the lack of fenestration on the upper portions of the gable ends at the north elevation of the house. May look too industrial.
- Some concerns relating to the use of a double gate at the northern end of the access road. More landscaping would be possible if the single gate design is retained.

**Summary:**

The panel is happy with the redesign of the Main House, the relocation and alignment of the lap pool and the relocation of the freestanding Stable. The lower height of the Main house is an improvement. Some concerns relating to the size of glazed roof overhangs, a possible industrial image projected by the proposed use of metal roofing/fenestration pattern and the use of a double gate at the north end of the access road.

**Motion:**

*To support the proposed changes to the project. Moved by Michelle McMaster and seconded by John Keen. Motion carried unanimously.*

**Address:** 1450 McRae Avenue  
**Inquirer:** Formwerks Architectural - Jim Bussey  
**Description:** To consider the proposed design of new townhouses with underground parking.  
**Status:** DE412659  
**Application:** First

**Program:**

CD-1 Rezoning for the site was approved by Council in March, 2008 to retain and restore the existing heritage Nichol House under HRA and allow the construction of 16 townhouses on one end of the site along Granville Street/McRae Avenue. Recently, there have been construction activities at the HRA portion of the site to relocate the existing heritage garage of the Nichol House. An application for Development Permit was recently made for the construction of new townhouses on the CD-1 portion of the site.

The architect briefly reviewed the process the project has undergone to acquire rezoning approval for this controversial site. The current proposal incorporated the following revisions to improve project design, some of which requires approval by the Director of Planning:

Architectural

- The original Building B is revised to include a single residence (now called Building C) and 3 unit block (now Building B) instead of the 5 unit block originally proposed, reducing the total number of townhouse units from 16 to 15. This was done to create an improved symmetrical entry point to the project off McRae Avenue.
- The creation of Buildings B and C also opens up the distance between the single residence component from the back of Nichol House to greater than the required 62' but accomplished only the distance of 53' between the 3 unit block and the heritage house.
- Revision of the access to the underground parking.
- Reduction of the number of underground parking stalls provided to 49 spaces.

- Design refinement to the exterior character of the proposed townhouse units based on Neo-Georgian style of distinctive buildings in the neighbourhood such as the one on 3390 The Crescent and the main house at Shannon Mew further south on Granville Street.
- Exterior construction of the townhouses includes poured in place concrete details and traditional-coloured bricks.
- Flat roofs were chosen for the development to minimize the apparent height of the townhouses.

### Landscaping

- Coniferous plantings with mature heights of 40' range are specified along the south property line adjacent to its neighbour, 5 Cedars with some scattered just behind the main entry to the project.
- Flowering dogwoods are specified for the central courtyard.
- Red Sunset and other varieties of maples to be planted in front of Building A townhouses.
- Snowbells and Magnolias specified behind Building B.
- Preserve and restore existing low 5' high stonewall. New 7' high (max.) concrete walls located closer to the townhouses will have Yew planting in front. Additional stonewalls provided as required to create a "layered" look to the front of the project.
- Provide evergreen shrubs adjacent to walkways.
- Use impervious pavers for driveways. The more than 5% slope site requirement precludes the use of pervious materials.
- Walkways to have pervious materials such as crush stones.
- The concrete retaining walls between Building B townhouses and Nichol House to be faced with 2' high bricks.
- The water feature creating a "white noise" in the central courtyard is smaller than originally planned.

### **Panel Questions:**

- What type of crush stone is used for the pervious gravel walkway? Project specifies "clear crush" in the central courtyard, not crush limestone nor pea gravel.
- Could a grander pedestrian access/entry be provided at Granville Street? No, this access is quite close to a relocated Bus Stop.
- Would the patio umbrellas located on rooftops of townhouses along Granville Street and McRae Avenue be visible from the streets? No, visual angle studies confirmed this.
- Retention Tank location? Close to the southwest corner of the site.
- Was "Gabion Basket" considered instead of the more expensive yew hedge specified in front of the new 7' high concrete walls? No, the landscaper does not think it is appropriate for this prominent site.
- Was the swimming pool for Nichol House deleted? Yes.
- Is there privacy fencing between Nichol House and the Building B townhouses? Yes. Fencing to be provided on top of the high retaining walls.
- Would the overhead gate to the underground parking create disturbing noises to the nearby townhouse units? No, the gate is mounted under a concrete slab.
- What is the role of FSADP in the approval process for the Development Permit application for this portion of the project that has been zoned out of First Shaughnessy District? Sailen Black confirmed that the site is not required to be reviewed by the FSADP. However, as a courtesy, this project is presented today because the panel has expressed an interest in the outcome of this application and the panel is well-qualified to offer advice on development in this area.
- Is exterior lighting of the project in keeping with the understated character of the First Shaughnessy neighbourhood? Yes.

- What are the requested variances on? Increase the % of Site impermeability allowed, Decrease the required 62' horizontal separation between the back of Nichol House and Block B townhouses, Increase the maximum building heights in portions of the sloping site due to grade changes, Increase the ramp grading to underground parking and out of grade crossing agreement for the Easterly Driveway, Removal of trees at the proposed east entry driveway boulevard and setback encroachments at various portions of the site.

**Planner Comments:** Sailen Black asks the panel to provide advice on the following issues regarding the current application:

- The proposed treatment of the grades on project frontage;
- The new relationship between Nichol House and the new configuration of Buildings B and C.
- The expression of building exteriors in terms of character, detailing and “fine grain design”.

**Panel Comments:**

- Some love the development, design of the buildings.
- Buildings B and C are an improvement over the original Building B.
- Most preferred a minimum distance of 62' separation between the back of Nichol House and Building B townhouses. Some has no problem with the reduced separation.
- Some finds the low key pedestrian access points off Granville Street and McRae Avenue acceptable. Others would like a more prominent access off Granville. One suggestion is for an arbour pavilion located at this access.
- Some are concerned about planting hedges to cover the unadorned concrete retaining walls along the fronting streets.
- Some are happy with the increased density brought by the proposed development. Some disagrees.
- All agree that the project is well designed.
- Most are pleased with the abundance of shrubs/tree plantings specified for the project and its “layering” effects. Some wondered if there are too many trees specified.
- The “Juliet” balconies should have door instead of windows behind them.
- Some concerns about the use of bricks, some with the colour of bricks specified. A more muted, heritage-like colour is preferred if bricks are used.
- Would like to see more stone work articulation on the building facades, especially at the end units to provide interesting punctuations to the project.
- Questions the mixed use of wrought iron and stone balustrades on the roof parapets.
- Most like the Neo-Georgian style chosen for the project. Some have reservations on the detailing of the facades of Building A at the interior courtyard. The horizontality of this façade is at odds with the distinct verticality of the building facades facing the perimeter streets.
- Some comment that the decks on the side of townhouses facing the central courtyard are too exposed and uninviting.
- Most like the flat roofs of the townhouses.
- Some comments about “oval” punch out windows on the facades of Building A.
- Some suggests simplifying the design of the pathways and amenities of the central courtyard.

**Summary:**

- Project design along the perimeter streets great. Like the low stone and concrete retaining walls.
- Good landscape design.
- Like the curved site plan layout of the townhouses.
- Would like to see less planting.
- Suggests redesign of the building exteriors facing the central courtyard to provide more animation and interest. Perhaps the introduction of some balconies?
- Like the redesign of the original Building B into a single residence and a 3 unit block.
- Mixed comments on the “oval” window.
- New pedestrian/vehicular main entry to the project is an improvement.
- Prefer a greater distance between the back of Nichol House and the townhouse development.

**Architect Response:**

- Will specify light-coloured bricks.
- Will make design revisions to the building facades of the end units more animated and interesting.

**Motion:**

*To support the project with comments addressed.*

*Moved by John Keen and seconded by Michelle McMaster. 7 members favour, 2 oppose. Carol Walker would like her name noted as opposed to the motion.*

**Meeting adjourned at 6:30PM**