

**First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel
Minutes of Meeting
July 21, 2011 – 4:00 pm – 6:30pm**

Present:	Lori Kozub	Chair, Resident, SHPOA
	David Cuan	Vice Chair, Resident, SHPOA
	Erika Gardener	Resident, SHPOA
	Judith Hansen	Heritage Commission
	John Keen	AIBC
	Jim Bussey	AIBC
	Paul Sangha	BCSLA
	Linda Collins	Resident Member at Large
	Jennifer Stamp	BCSLA
	Regrets:	Phil Yacht
	Mamie Angus	Resident Member at Large
	Paul Woo	Resident, SHPOA
	Lisa McIntosh	Real Estate Board
	Victor Piller	Resident, SHPOA
City Staff:	Ann McLean	Development Planner, UDDPC
Recording Secretary	Prit Toor	ARKS

Agenda

Business:

1. Review Minutes June 9, 2011
2. Project Updates
3. Other Business

New Business:

1. Address: 3550 Maple Street
Inquirer: Victor Eric Design Group
Status: Enquiry
Previous: First
2. Address: 3660 East Boulevard Avenue
Inquirer: Andrew Cheung Architects
Status: Third Enquiry
Previous: April 20th & May 19th, 2011

Meeting

Business, 4:00-4:15

Chair Lori Kozub called the meeting to order at 4:00pm and noted the presence of a quorum.

1. Review of Minutes of June 9, 2011
Change word “winders” to “windows” on Page 8

1288 The Crescent:

Add “review of Property 2 before” on page 4, 2nd paragraph.

Add the comment “lacked tripartite expression” to bullet 5 on page 4.

Motion to Approve Minutes, Seconded. All in Favor. Passed

2. Projects Updates
There are no updates at this time.
3. The Administration Bulletin Draft regarding the FSODP has been completed and distributed to the Panel. Panel has been asked to provide comments to David Cuan who will summarize all points and report back to Ann McLean. The draft will be copied to Vancouver Heritage Commission and circulated to the board of SHPOA as well for comments.

New Business, 4:15 – 6:00

Chair discussed with Panel the new format of the Meeting Minutes. Panel Members favoured the new layout and design. This new format would provide clarity for Applicants regarding Panel’s comments and recommendations. Chair would appreciate any further feedback.

Business Meeting

1. 3550 - 3560 Maple Street
First Enquiry
Presentation: Victor Eric Design Group - Moe Morani Architect

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Morani presented. He discussed that 3560 Maple was renovated by adding an addition in the 1980's. Today, the owner's intention is to upgrade the building interior to add a master bedroom and a rec room. From an exterior perspective the area that will be affected will be at the rear of the building. The front will not have any changes. The basement will only have minor changes, and will not adding any more floor area. The front elevation is not affected by the changes. The side elevation beside the garage does not have any changes to the current roof or massing. The rear elevation will be slightly different in order to add the roof above the garage. The other side of the house where the garage is will also have a slight change to the elevation.

Mr. Morani also presented the preliminary landscape plan. This shows that all the healthy trees will be retained, the large cedars on the front of the property to be removed and replaced with a hedge to achieve the desired landscape layering. In the back garden all the trees are kept, but this is still a preliminary design.

Mr. Morani took questions from the Panel.

Applicant responded with further information.

- Materials will be kept mostly the same.
- Aluminum windows that will be replaced with wood windows.
- House became a multiple conversion in the 80's
- There is a covenant on the building to keep it from being demolished.
- There are windows in the rec room and family room
- The colour of the house shall stay the same.
- As of yet there is no arborist's report, just have the recommendations from the landscape architect.
- Plans to retain the same number of dwelling units as existing.
- The two tenants share the yard equally both the front and back.

Planning Comments and Questions to the Panel:

Planning Commentary:

This is an existing multiple conversion dwelling was added to in 1983. At that time a covenant was put on the property which retains the pre-date building. The exterior addition to this building is relatively modest and at this time we do not anticipate that the project will come before the Panel as part of a DE Application.

Planning staff will be asking for some landscape improvements as part of the application as well as additional windows to the addition over the garage. Need to balance updates with exterior.

Questions to the Panel:

Do you have any comments on the proposed addition and landscape with regard to the FSODP and Guidelines?

Panel Commentary:

- The Panel supports the renovation but would like to have the proposed roof at the back complement the existing roof and overall building character.
- The Panel members are concerned that the exterior of the house does not meet the standards of the ODP and would suggest stylistic changes including:
 - major improvements to the fenestration of the house,
 - replace the windows/metal railings
 - neutral colour would be better than the pink suggested for the house.
- The Panel has no issue with the front cedars being removed but the layering affect is not in keeping with the guidelines. Just adding a hedge isn't enough and there is very little other landscape added in the current plan. The Panel would like to see a more complete landscape plan.

Chair Summary:

- Panel members approve the renovations you are requesting.
- The Panel would like the owner to consider additional renovations to the exterior of the home to bring it up to ODP standards. This would add more value to the property.
Consider:
 - Updating the façade to neighborhood standards
 - Replacing aluminum windows, metal railings,
 - Updating the exterior color to a more neutral palate.
- The Panel would like the owner to review the ODP and walk around the neighborhood to get a sense of the ODP standards.
- The Panel would like help the owner complete a better overall renovation.

Motion:

Motion for DE Application addressing Panel Comments. Seconded. All in Favour. Passed.

2. 3660 East Boulevard
Enquiry: Third
Presentation: Francis Yeow, Andrew Cheung Architects, David Thompson Landscape Architect

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Yeow s presented the list of changes that were made based on the Panel's feedback. The garage has been relocated back to the original spot. There are changes to the kitchen to allow easier access to the garage. The design of the garage is further developed to complement the house. Cannot avoid some steps, but minimized the steps from the garage into the house. The front elevation of the house is simplified. Details like the trim and crown mouldings are simplified, the dormer as well. There is more stone added to the material list, including limestone on the front elevation. To address the issue of flat roofs: The current design shows a peak roof with little arch window over the Breakfast Area and a peak glass canopy over the Covered Porch at the rear of the house. Unfortunately, the flat roofs over the front decks remain as the owner believes that a design change will compromise the look of the house. If the proposed flat roofing membrane is not accepted, the architect will consider gently metal clad pitched roofs within the parapets. The side elevation was very preliminary before but now the windows are lined up and with proper detailing to complement the front elevation. We have also aligned of the fireplace chimneys.

Followed the architect the landscape architect noted not many changes from the last presentation. A total of 6 steps have been added from the garage to the kitchen. This is the most direct entry. Plants will be added to build up the changes in elevation. The large lawn area has been moved to where the most sunlight is.

Mr. Yeow and Mr. Thompson took questions from the Panel.

Applicants responded with further information:

- At this time unsure what the material for the sports court would be, most likely concrete or stone as it is supposed to be for basketball.
- The exact type of metal roof cladding over the front deck has not been determined.

Planning Comments and Questions to the Panel

Planning Comments:

The Panel reviewed this proposal on May 19th, 2011. The Panel had concerns about the flat portions of the roof and their fit in the FSD neighbourhood. It was felt that the front elevation needed some simplification and the other elevations needed to be developed further. There were also several comments directed at improving the function of the rear yard and its relationship to the interior space.

Planning has reviewed a preliminary response to these comments and has asked for further attention to the rationalizing and simplifying the approach to detail expression and fenestration. Further work may be required to marry the Mediterranean landscape approach with the FSD guidelines.

Questions to Panel:

Have the revisions adequately addressed the Panel's previous concerns?
Do you have further commentary on this more developed design with regard to the FSODP and Guidelines?

Panel Commentary:

- Panel members believed the design is not supportable. It is too eclectic for First Shaughnessy. French chateau mixed with English Arts and Crafts and Modern with Mediterranean landscape elements do not provide a coherent design. The fenestration is too diverse and these elements that do not go together. Chimneys appear to be out of scale.
- The Panel does not support the flat roof and the suggested materials for use. It is not an appropriate form for First Shaughnessy.
- The Panel was concerned about the large attic having 4 large windows. Members were apprehensive that this space may be developed into a useable room for future use.
- Many Panel Members felt the landscape design was very similar to the last presentation and doesn't respond to the ODP.
 - The front garden similar comments to the backyard, even though described as layered that is not evident.
 - Geometric design vs. asymmetrical.
 - Privacy seems to be a concern in the south side yard with the fountain
 - Front elevation which is so busy
 - The staircase leading to the rose garden really serves any purpose at all.
- Majority of Panel members believe the back elevation is not balanced.

Chair Summary:

We appreciate your efforts to provide some changes since the last meeting. Comparing your submission with your inspiration French design photo examples, we see two completely different styles. Your inspiration photos, French style, have very simple lines and design. This does not reflect your current plan. The front facade has become very eclectic, and not supportable. This design does not meet with the ODP guidelines nor represents a Mediterranean garden design. If you want a French feel, take a look at a house that fits more into the Shaughnessy French style genre on 16th and Fir. Pay attention to the roof line of the house, it is not flat. I would suggest you discuss the Panel concerns and comments with your client.

Motion:

Motion to have this project moved to a Fourth Inquiry addressing Panel Comments. Seconded. All in favour. Passed. (John Keen was not present for the vote)