

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

MINUTES from the Meeting of Dec 10, 2009, 4:00 pm

Present:

Lori Kozub	Chair SHPOA
David Cuan	Resident SHPOA
Erika Gardner	Resident SHPOA
Victor Piller	Resident SHPOA
Clinton Cuddington	Resident Member at Large
Phil Yacht	Resident Member at Large
Loy Leyland	AIBC
Lu Tang	AIBC
Paul Sangha	BCSLA
Michelle McMaster	BCSLA
Judith Hansen	Heritage Commission
Ann McLean	Development Planner, City of Vancouver

Regrets:

Lisa Macintosh	REBGV
Mamie Angus	Resident Member at Large
George Chow	City Council
Wilfred Ng	Resident Member at Large

Recording Secretary: Lu Tang

Staff Contact: Ann McLean, Development Planner, 604-873-7387

AGENDA

Business:

1. Review of Minutes of Nov 19, 2009
2. Recent Projects Update
3. Presentation: Heritage Planner, Yardley McNeill, "Vancouver Heritage Register"
4. Dates for 2010 FSADP meetings

New Business:

1. 1527 West King Edward Avenue
Enquirer: B.L. Ling Architect (Ben Ling)
Description: To consider the proposed design of a new single family house.
Review: Enquiry (First)
2. 1320 West 15th Avenue
Formwerks Architectural
Description: To consider the proposed design of a new single family house
Review: Enquiry (Second)
3. 3389 Cypress Street
Enquirer: Raffaele and Associates

Description: To consider the proposed design of a new single family house
Review: Enquiry (Second for this design – previous design reviewed on Nov 19, 2009)

MEETING

4:00 PM Business:

1. Review of Minutes

Panel reviewed the October 29, 2009 and Nov 19, 2009 Minutes
Approved with minor corrections.

2. Recent Projects Update

There are no new projects updates.

3. Presentation: Heritage Planner, Yardley McNeill, “Vancouver Heritage Register”

There are three categories of heritage classifications, A, B and C. They are based on buildings that have historic merit, are over 25 years old, with the majority built prior to 1940. Historic merit includes architectural, cultural, and context values.

Classification A: Are properties of national significance. Eg. O Canada House, Marine Building and Glen Brae.

Classification B: are properties with local significance and generally have strong aesthetic values. Eg. Fire Hall #15,

Classification C: are properties that unto themselves do not hold a great degree of historic value, but when seen in conjunction with similar buildings on a street, create a heritage precinct. E.g. Warehouses along Beatty Street..

The heritage program started in 1986 with approximately 2800 properties at the time. The classification can be changed, as certain sites become more precious over time, or conversely lose their value through either insensitive alterations or their context changes. The list is about 90% accurate. However, it would be fair to say that the list does not contain all the sites in Vancouver with historic value. Within the list, about 500 are legally protected through municipal designation.

Council’s Heritage Policies and Guidelines outline incentive options to assist an owner’s efforts to preserve the property. The concept is to make an owner whole financially, so they are not out the costs to preserve the character defining features of the site in order to preserve its historic value. . The Character Defining Elements are defined within the sites “Statement of Significance” and sanctioned by the Vancouver Heritage Commission. In the City of Vancouver, the Real Estate Services Department analyzes an owners financial Performa to determine whether compensation is warranted. Compensation is typically granted by Council in conjunction with the owner’s agreement to designate the heritage building.

The Vancouver Heritage Register was created in 1986, but has not been updated since that time. New sites are added as staff are made aware of them, either through an owner coming forward with a development proposal, or a neighbourhood that has identified a site that holds value for their area. The City intends on updating the Register when funding becomes available. Understandably, this would be a significant piece of policy work for the City as it would require a review of the entire City. Buildings could also have interior importance as well as exterior significance. For further

information, the Cities web site outlines heritage polices and programs or you can contact the Heritage Group within the Planning Department.

Next meeting learning topic: How City staff check the technical data and how they process development applications at Planning Department.

3. Dates for 2010 FSDAP meetings

Scheduled Dates for 2010 meetings are as follows:

- January 21, February 11, March 04 (maybe cancelled due to Olympic Games), March 25
- April 15, May 06, May 27, June 17
- July 08, July 29, August 19, September 09, Sept 30th
- Oct 21, December 02

New Business:

1. 1527 West King Edward Avenue

Enquirer: B.L. Ling Architect (Ben Ling)

Description: To consider the proposed design of a new single family house.

Review: Enquiry (First)

Presented by Architect B.L. Ling and View Point Landscape Architects:

- This is the 2nd house near the corner of Granville and West King Edward Ave.
- Currently the property has tall hedges in the front of the property
- There are other old timer houses as well as Georgian style houses in close proximity
- This house is designed with the Frank Lloyd Wright style in mind.
- The intent of this design is to provide privacy and reduce street noise. Use of layering at the front of the building, keeping some of the existing hedges, with a lower wall behind, with a distinctive entrance gate, porch and the front door, etc. is the intent of the design
- We are using wide gutters, wider and heavier trims
- Maximum roof overhang, up to 1 meter proposed to increase the visual prominence of the roof, robust fascia board, together with the emphasized soffit treatment adding weight to the roof.
- Finishes are redbrick, dark stained wood mullions, fine dashed stucco. Robust brick columns and concrete column caps.

Landscape:

- Existing hedge is dead on the inside, not visible from outside - intend to keep the west side portion and the Alberta spruce.
- Some hedges may come out – depending on final inspection. East yard has some very nice pine trees.
- Design intended to be three layers from the public sidewalk to the front door, screened with filigree, and a layer of shrubs and fence, and then step into the “gate house”, which is 3 – 4 steps above.
- Relating to space around the house well, extensive outdoor living spaces at rear, taking advantage of the west sun light.
- Open living area towards East, garage access from behind.
- Brick fence with concrete at front property line and porch wall.

- Over all, there is a celebration of entry progression to the house, with articulation of spaces around it.

Questions and Answers:

Q: Seems like a long distance from garage to house, how many cars in garage?

A: Two car garage... there is no covered walk way, zoning not allowed.

Q: Where is the gate, hard to see?

A: Gate at main elevation, this plan is an earlier version;

Q: Porch on front, extends beyond the setback, the side setback infringes

A: This is only conceptual; it will be coordinated next time.

Q: Actual sf is less? Maybe good to add under the gate house... leave some cushion for future?

A: Yes

Q: What is the style of the house and the inspiration?

A: Layering... approaching the house with serious of progression as Frank Lloyd Wright did a lot of those in Oak Park, with thick columns, heavy fascia boards, etc.

Q: Overhanging... over hang can prevent water problems?

A: Wide overhang, heavy beams... lower the height of the floor to floor...yes, less water problems, and compress the building to only 31 feet in total height?

Q: Have you considered a gable and hip expression?

A: Yes, double fascia boards.

Q: Sunken Patio? Where is it?

A: It is an oversight... unresolved at the moment.

Q: Any large tree will be taken down?

A: Apple trees, yes.

Planning's Comments:

The Director of Planning is seeks the Panel's comments with regards to the general requirements of the FSD ODP and Guidelines.

Comments:

- Nice and interesting style.
- Ensure estate like quality... make a bold statement at front, not understated
- Focus on entrance – working through the scale
- Emphasis on overhang/hip to allow for true FLW design – ask for relaxation to allow for true FLW design characteristics
- Requires better proportion
- Feeling it is suffering a bit of design limitation due to the building envelope.
- Can be much taller; think the back yard works well
- Perhaps think along the line how FLW did his Oak Park Residence with the tree in the courtyard projecting into the house that the building wrapped around it, as the essence of his architecture is in respecting the nature and what is already there
- Integrated thinking with architecture and landscape to bring the design to more depth and

details.

- Moving house back perhaps?
- Like material combinations
- Create outdoor spaces... manipulating the building a bit more, might come closer to what you want to do
- Like the spacious back garden and preserving of the hedges – focus on estate like character – truer to FLW style integrating garden.

Chair's Summary:

In general, the members liked the initial concept and believe that the home with suggestions from the Panel will continue to develop into a strong design.

MOTION: To come back for a second Enquiry with the above comments addressed.

- Seconded and,
All in favour. Carried.

2. 1320 West 15th Avenue

Formwerks Architectural

Description: To consider the proposed design of a new single family house

Review: Enquiry (Second)

Architect and Landscape architect presented the project:

- House pushed forward, adds more backyard, making it not as intrusive
- Change in parking design, with two way traffic
- Realize front door issue on main house is not resolved. We tried moving the two other doors to the sides interferes with the parking design.
- There is no additional FSR
- Losing 5 large trees but are adding total of 24 new trees
- Infill house design is more linear, and better in our mind, still with the inspiration of the Voysey style house.
- Finishing materials: stone based, textural stucco, dynamic wood details, wood shingles, flashing, roof will be copper.
- Concentrate on the preservation of trees and screening and buffering, the entire front is common area, and a new pond is added

Questions and Comments:

Q: How wide is the drive way portion?

A: To the north, widened a little, kept at the minimum and mostly just shoulders.

Q: No direct access to sidewalk?

A: Not at the moment.

Planning's Comments:

The Panel saw this as an enquiry on Oct 29, meeting and commented on four options. Option 3 and 4 were preferred. The Panel's comments are summarized here:

- 1) Option Three: smaller surface parking for the middle suite only, and two cars each for the side residence underground... same for the infill, setback is about 88 feet. Smallest front yard, Infill house design is the same for Option Two and Three.
- 2) Option Four: not much requirement for visitor parking at the moment in the area. Slightly over the maximum FSR. Front yard setback is about 101 feet, Infill design is the same for Option One and Four.

Further design development was required for siting, amount of green space and parking, Main house entry design, and a clarification on the vehicle access.

Questions to the Panel : Has the proposal addressed the previous comments of the Panel? Do you have further comments with regard to the general requirements of the FSD ODP and Guidelines?

Comments:

- Significant progress made since last review

- Alternatives of drive way design, wondering if there should be a driveway as such, or should there be a change? Original house is at its previous location?
- Difficult archway design to the main house
- The Orchard House style infill as an inspiration is not quite resolved. The infill is competing with the main house in character.
- In terms of sitting of building, NE corner easy up the approach to the coach house, not quite resolved
- Park like estate, more separation between the houses is better.
- Nice to see some real garden spaces, not just a bunch of divided patio space at back as previous design
- Nice detailing for bay window in front, good use of materials
- Large estate house is what we are looking for... when I look at the backyard; it is not chopped up as before... feels like serious gardens instead of little town houses.
- Separation has created privacy patios
- Focus on more estate like perspective, the town house look issue is still there, with three doors at the front
- Parking issues addressed
- Looks like the house was cut in half and too symmetrical, needs to be addressed and represent other homes in Shaughnessy that are not symmetrical
- Lots of work done... and definitely addresses lots of concerns. Still too much paving.
- Wondered if the architect can flip the house... and the lane, for privacy. Please take a look at the two houses. Drive way needs to be considered carefully.
- Central entry needs more emphasis, maybe a series of progressions leading to it. Offset the difference significantly from the side entries.
- Formal entry at front perhaps can be address by adding an elegant formal stone gate at the property line, and thru the driveway with the walkway access.
- Possibly create a separate sidewalk for a more interesting path along the pond, etc for the side entrances as garden walkway
- Requires a more formal estate entry
- Looks like a triplex, not an old estate home
- Add interest to the front garden.
- Nice work, keep going.

Chair's Summary:

Need to see the entry way issues resolved with a proper entrance and final design to represent an estate like manner to ensure the main house doesn't look like a triplex. The infill needs more design consideration, to ensure that there is a true distinction from the principal house and the infill.

MOTION: Proceed to DP application, with the above comments addressed.

- Seconded and,
- One against, all other favoured. Carried.

3. 3389 Cypress Street

Enquirer: Raffaele and Associates

Description: To consider the proposed design of a new single family house

Review: Enquiry (Second for this design – previous design reviewed on Nov 19, 2009)

Architect presented the design and discussed overall concept based on recommendations from last presentation. Made a lot of changes from last time with some of the comments addressed. .

Questions and Answers:

Q: The FSR is about 600sf over from the previous design?

A: yes.

Q: Has the designer investigated into the sunlight, sense of space... development and thoughts into that space?

A: Western windows are not projected into side yard setback.

Q: How high is the crawl space? And what is the intention of the use?

A: 4 feet. There is no intention to use as full height space. Part of the outcome for having the floor plate, the way it is.

Planning's comments:

The Panel reviewed this as an enquiry at our last meeting and recommended simplification and strengthening of the overall form, including roof form and further design development to the house/garden relationship and materials.

Questions to the Panel:

Has the proposal addressed the previous comments of the Panel? Do you have further comments with regard to the general requirement of the FSD ODP and Guidelines?

Comments:

- You are over the FSR ratio substantially, the separate garage is counted
- House is too large/voluminous
- The roof line has not changed
- Made some significant changes from last time
- Consider softening the roof lines, this still needs to be addressed as there are two different languages together
- Still a very busy design/facade
- Sustainably better, ties together much better, parking issue is an interesting one.
- The house is taking up too much of the property. It seems too large for the lot.
- The landscape revised plan is not here yet.
- No information from landscape regarding patio height
- The bell curve roof... not sure, like the previous roof line better.
- Materials are good; still too much house about 5% over the FSR.
- Should increase the garden area, reduce house area.
- Can't go over FSR allowable.
- Not engaged, in a timid way. You need to tie in all four façades and design together

- On landscape side, break down fortification ;layering will soften the effect, rendering the house behind it.
- Building is taking up too much of the lot.
- Skirt around the tower should incorporate the overhang into the tower. It is disproportionate. Consider extending the skirt.
- Better to use the basement for parking, thus reduce the ground level area for garden and open up the use of space. This may be a good solution for your problem.

Chair's Summary:

Simplify the roof line-connection, overhang, and tie-in together better with the rest of the façade and design. Considering the basement as parking; area over FSR is not acceptable. Updated landscape plan required for next review.

MOTION: To come back as a third enquiry addressing exceeding the FSR limit with additional comments addressed, including updated landscape plan.

- Seconded and,
- One opposed all other in favour. Carried.

Meeting Adjourned.

END OF MINUTES