

**First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel**  
**MINUTES of Meeting**  
**October 25, 2012 - 4:00 pm – 5:55 pm**

---

|                 |                    |                                 |
|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| <b>Present:</b> | Robert Miranda     | Chair, Resident Member at Large |
|                 | Katherine Reichert | Vice- Chair, Resident- SHPOA    |
|                 | Erika Gardner      | Resident-SHPOA                  |
|                 | Alastair Munro     | Resident-SHPOA                  |
|                 | John Chan          | Resident-SHPOA                  |
|                 | Linda Collins      | Resident Member-at-Large        |
|                 | Sabine Wood        | Resident Member-at-Large        |
|                 | Clinton Cuddington | AIBC                            |
|                 | Jim Bussey         | AIBC                            |
|                 | Paul Sangha        | BCSLA                           |
|                 | Jennifer Stamp     | BCSLA                           |
|                 | Lisa McIntosh      | Real Estate Board               |
|                 | David Cuan         | Heritage Commission             |

|                 |                  |                               |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Regrets:</b> | George Affleck   | Councillor, City of Vancouver |
|                 | Kerri-Lee Watson | Resident Member-at-Large      |

|                     |            |                            |
|---------------------|------------|----------------------------|
| <b>City Staff :</b> | Tim Potter | Development Planner, UDDPC |
|---------------------|------------|----------------------------|

**Recording Secretary:** Samantha Luk

---

**AGENDA**

**Business:**

1. Review of Minutes dated September 13 Minutes.
2. Project Updates

**New Business:**

Address: 1050 Laurier  
Inquirer: Loy Leyland Architect  
Status: Enquiry  
Review: First

Address: 1664 Cedar Crescent  
Inquirer: Loy Leyland Architect  
Status: Enquiry  
Review: Second

## **MEETING**

### **Business**

Chair, Robert Miranda called the meeting at 4:05pm and noted that there was a quorum.

1. Review of Minutes dated September 13, 2012.

Motion was made to pass the Minutes. Seconded; Passed.

2. Project Updates

4049 Cartier Street: The project has altered and has moved away from a second crossing. The turret has been deleted in favour of a more modest expression. The Director of Planning has reviewed the proposed changes and appreciates that the applicant has been responsive to panel feedback.

3660 East Boulevard: The project's revised landscape design is under review by staff.

### **New Business**

#### **1050 Laurier:**

The building will be built with traditional materials and will consist of a tower element. The property currently has access from the lane. The proposal is to move the crossing to the west side and arborist report has stated the existing trees on that side have little or no value. Additionally, because the topography is much higher and there will be less excavation. The proposal is to either place the garage parking doors at the back of the house or on the side. A cherry tree will be removed and the arborist has recommended it be replaced with coniferous trees. There will be a mid level terrace in the back between the house and the yard and a water feature will be incorporated. The gazebo will be the focal point in the back yard. The fence will have a stone base and wrought iron metal with hedging to add layering. A water feature in the front yard to act as a buffer for noise and an arching pedestrian pathway is proposed in the front yard.

#### **Questions from the Panel:**

Mr. Leyland took questions from the Panel.

Applicants responded with further information:

- A free standing garage was not an option due to concerns over square footage.
- This property has a back lane.
- The east to west topography in the back is pretty flat.
- It was the client's request to have French doors.
- The neighboring house on the west side of the property is not too close and will and there will be adequate room between houses.

**Planning Comments to the Panel:**

This is a proposal for a new house on a site containing a post-date existing house. Planning has reviewed this enquiry internally. The Director of Planning is not in favour of Option B and there are some privacy concerns over the windows next to the staircase.

**Planning Questions to the Panel:**

Comments on the merits of Option A and Option B relative to parking access, tree retention and amount of site excavation and disturbance are asked for.

**Panel's Comments:**

- All panel members prefer option A to Option B.
- One member feels that the restoration of grade is a positive move to give some weight to the bottom of the building.
- There was some concern about the garage door being fully on display. One solution offered was to see if the gazebo could be used as foil to prevent a straight run through the property.
- The restoration of grade is a positive move to give some weight to the bottom of the building.
- One member would like to see the project move away from asphalt shingles.
- There were concerns with the large windows on the west side adjacent to the stairs and whether there should be more privacy.
- Some members would like to see more planting behind the gazebo. Additionally, landscape would be best utilized to conceal any unwanted sights such as the dumpsters at the rear east property line.
- One member felt there was a huge grade change from the front of the property to the back and that the house needs to be better related to the garden.
- Some members are not in favour of a u-shaped walkway. They feel that the design of the front entry walkway and back garden do not have to be symmetrical because the house is not.
- Some members would like to see if the house can be pushed back to alleviate the issue surrounding the Pine tree.
- One member feels that trees that will be replanted on the property need to be robust and significant. Large trees are needed to scale the size of the house back down.

**Summary of the Panel's Comments:**

The panel members like the overall design and overwhelmingly prefer option A. There are concerns with the large windows on the west side and members feel that there is a need for more privacy. The panel is not in favour of a u-shaped walkway and feel that the house needs to be better related to the garden.

**Motion:**

None as this was an enquiry.

**1664 Cedar Crescent:**

This a double frontage site with two existing crossings, one on Cedar Crescent and Pine Crescent. The building has been simplified and the cupola has been integrated more into the roof form. Parking has been moved to the west side, which has increased the size of the rear yard. A high stone base has been added to act as an anchor and the entry has been adjusted so that the stairs will go up to the main entry level. A walk out light well has been removed and detailing has been toned down for a more consistent and uniformed house.

There is a 20 feet grade change from the front to the back of the property. Walls on both sides of the driveway will be between 6 inches and 2 feet in height. A retaining wall will be added to the property line so that the driveway feels like its part of the garden. A trellis structure is proposed on the side to incorporate some greenery and a garden element. Access from the driveway to the backyard is difficult as there is a 12 foot grade change. The stairs have been broken up so there is not a long run and planters will be added to soften the look. An alcove before the entry gate is proposed as well as a small water feature to make the space more inviting. An outdoor kitchen, hot tub, gazebo, fire table, and seating area will be added to the back yard. A terrace will be added and paving will be extended up to the lawn. A second set of stairs has been eliminated from the original proposal and an entrance gate will be added on the Pine Crescent side. An existing cedar hedge will be kept because it is on city property.

**Questions from the Panel:**

Mr. Leyland took questions from the Panel.

Applicants responded with further information:

- 11-16 trees will be removed
- The location of the gazebo relative to the house is an axial view from the inside of the family room.
- The lawn on the south side will have a 3 feet wall comprised of stone.
- The copula is not higher than the ridge line
- The gazebo will probably not be visible from the back or the front because of the hedge.
- The underground garage will fit 3 cars.

### **Planning Comments:**

This is a second enquiry having appeared at the Panel last year in December. There seems to be more trees and landscaping on the east side compared to the west side. There isn't a strong desire to have a deck in the front yard and the windows and openings needs to be simplified.

### **Questions to the Panel**

Has the design successfully resolved the issue of access and parking for the site?

Review and comment on basic form, massing, and expression of the roof.

General comments and feedback on the design relative to the FSODP and Guidelines.

### **Panel's comments**

- Members appreciate the simplification of the site plan and the relationship of the building to the street and garden.
- There are some concerns with the front and north elevation. There is a strong axial line down the middle and the three windows in relation to the secondary axis is a concern. There is a suggestion for the roof peaks on each side to be lined up on centre with the two secondary axis thus giving it more control.
- A panel member suggested instead of adding a cupola to gain height, alternatively to ask for a relaxation of the allowable 35 feet and add another feature. Some other members agree and support this suggestion.
- Some members don't mind the cupola and believe that because it is a double frontage site, the cupola could add grandeur to the back of the house.
- There are concerns that a duroid roof and metal cupola will not complement each other well.
- There is a suggestion to remove the belly-band that is going across the main and second floor to allow for a stronger expression of a tri-partite because the roof, the middle, and the base would be clearer.
- One member appreciates switching the driveway to the west side as there is now more of a front yard. The landscape design is also well liked.
- There are concerns with how close in proximity the hot tub is to the house and whether it can be moved further into the garden for more privacy.
- One member feels that large trees will have to be replanted and strategically located to anchor the house into the surrounding neighbourhood.
- There are concerns with livability issues surrounding the nanny suite.
- One member would like to see a heftier architectural bracket underneath the suspending chimney on the west elevation.
- The backyard seems very crowded and there is a need for more symmetry.
- One member is concerned with the floating chimney over the garage door and feels this feature needs to be addressed.
- One member suggests that there needs to be at least 3 feet in planting space in the sunken area near the neighbours.

- There are concerns that the keystone elements in the balcony are heavy relative to the simplicity of the house.
- There is a suggestion to try to tie in the gazebo and extend it as an architectural element or amalgamate it with the existing sitting area.
- There is concern with the skylights over the covered areas and that the area is not deep enough for it.
- One member felt that although the front deck and light well may not be a great feature, with vegetation they could be hidden.
- There are concerns with the windows at the front of the house and a need for simplification.

**Summary of the Panel's Comments:**

The Panel appreciates the changes to the site plan and likes the overall design of the house. There are some concerns with the design at the front and west elevation of the house, which need to be addressed. Features in the backyard including the gazebo and location of the hot tub also need to be looked at. Some panel members have made suggestions to review the cupola and to see if there is an alternative solution to create a sense of height.

**Motion:**

None as this was an enquiry.

Meeting adjourned at 5:55 pm.