

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel
MINUTES of Meeting
May 31, 2012 - 4:07 pm – 8:18 pm

Present:	Robert Miranda	Chair, Resident
	Kathy Reichert	Vice Chair, Resident, SHPOA
	Erika Gardner	Resident, SHPOA
	Linda Collins	Resident Member-at-Large
	Sabine Wood	Resident Member-at-Large
	Kerri Lee Watson	Resident Member-at-Large
	Alastair Munro	SHPOA
	Jennifer Stamp	BCSLA
	Jim Bussey	AIBC
	Clinton Cuddington	AIBC
	Lisa MacIntosh	REBGV
	David Cuan	Heritage Commission
	George Affleck	Councillor, City of Vancouver
Regrets:	Paul Sangha	BCSLA
	John Chan	SHPOA
City Staff :	Tim Potter	Development Planner, UDDPC
Recording Secretary:	Samantha Luk	

AGENDA

Business:

1. Review of Minutes of February 16, 2012
2. Project Updates

New Business:

1. Address: 1451 Angus Drive
Inquirer: Jim Bussey
Status: Enquiry
Review: Second

2. Address: 3989 Granville St
Inquirer: Alan Diamond
Status: Enquiry
Review: First

3. Address: 3990 Marguerite St
Inquirer: Jim Bussey
Status: Enquiry
Review: First

MEETING

Business, 4:07pm - 4:15pm:

Chair Robert Miranda called the meeting at 4:07pm and noted a quorum.

1. Review of Minutes of February 16th 2012: Minutes had not been distributed and was deferred until the next meeting.
2. Project Updates
 - 4049 Cartier St – application for a new development will get brought forward once revisions have been completed
 - 3660 East Blvd – The application is in early review will likely be reviewed as an application at the next meeting.
 - 1350 West 15th Ave – There is concern amongst the neighbours that what is being built is deviating from the information sent out to the neighbours. The primary issue is the height and position of the building. Planning department will be notified.

A site visit was conducted at 3:00pm prior to the meeting.

New Business

1. 1451 Angus Drive

Presentation: Jim Bussey

Mr. Bussey presented an updated proposal based on feedback from the first enquiry. An existing addition to the house will be extended and a sun porch will be added. The existing Cedar tree near this addition will be kept to enhance the estate like character of the site. In the backyard, one tree will be kept, but a Fir tree will be removed in the front yard. At the front of the house, an addition has been added subservient to the main portion of the home, which has the same pitch of the roof and an added dormer. On the side of the house, the roofline of the addition cuts below the windows on the east side. Therefore, the roofline will not be blocking the windows, only the dormers which projects

out. A majority of the east and south facing heritage elements will be kept. Mr. Bussey noted that after comments from the last panel meeting, there was a substantial amount of redesign done on the back façade of the house on the north elevation. A dormer was added to hold the large windows to light the interior hallway of the house. The five car garage originally proposed during the first enquiry has been amended. Two car spaces have been eliminated from the original garage and two other spaces have been rotated. The eliminated parking spaces will not be attached to the house and a small bedroom will be added above it to act as a coach house. Mr. Bussey indicated that reducing the size of the original garage would save significant amount of trees at the property line.

Questions:

Mr. Bussey took questions from the Panel.

The applicant responded with further information:

- The structure of the coach house protrudes 10 feet into the setback
- There will be two kitchens and the garage will reduce some light into one kitchen
- The new chimney will be made of stucco to create differentiation, however it can be changed to brick.
- Wood windows will be installed
- The east side balcony will be removed completely on top of the port-cochere in favour of the east addition
- The addition will be a gable roof
- The colour scheme will be replicated to the existing scheme, however, it is not known whether it is the original colour scheme
- The garage could not be accommodated under the house
- Due to the size of the property, there is a limit of 5 car parking spaces
- The back deck over the Japanese maple will be suspended and will be made of wood
- The storm water storage system will be under the driveway

Planning Comments:

The Panel reviewed this proposal on February 16, 2012. The Panel's comment summary request simplification of the rear addition to the house. The front/side additions were generally supported as well as the second (new) crossing. The Panel asked to see the proposal again during DE application. For this site, the parking bylaw states that there is a 5 car limit. However, technically, the parking spot under the porte-cochere is considered a 6th parking space.

Questions to the Panel:

Have the revisions adequately addressed the Panel's previous comments. Please comment on the landscape design shown in the front yard, specifically with respect to paving shown for automobile and pedestrian travel routes.

Comments:

- Most panel members were appreciative of the decision to retain the house and felt that the revisions adequately addressed previous comments.
- One panel member wanted to see some easing up on the plans for the west side of the driveway to make room for the existing trees.
- Some members would like to see the arborist report on the 100 foot cedar, because they feel the media centre may gut the roots of the tree
- One member noted that there is a good gap between the trees to make way for the driveway at the southwest corner of the property.
- One member suggested that she did not think the parking spot under the porte-cochere was secure and that it should not count as a parking space.
- Some members were concerned with the turning radius of the additional 2 car garage. Further investigation of the geometry between the two garages is needed.
- Some members feel that a 4 or 5 car garage is better suited for the property. They feel that the 2 car garage with the nanny suite above segregates the backyard.
 - One member has concerns what it will do the general massing of the house based on the roof plans and elevations.
 - Some members feel that the 2 car garage will take a lot of light away from the kitchen especially because of the northern exposure.
- Some members are concerned with the amount of paving in the front yard and the reflecting pool in the lawn area. One member suggests moving it further south of the porte-cochere.
- One member felt that fewer pavers in the front yard and around the reflection pool may be a way to incorporate more greenness.
- One member is concerned with the grading of the root zone around the driveway.
- One member feels that landscape plan is not strong enough and needs a lot of design development. She would also like to see a more joyful way to enter as a pedestrian in the front yard.
- One member would like further investigation into the colours of the house and whether the current colours are in the Shaughnessy registry.

Comments Summary:

The Panel likes the work that has been done on the house. But there are particular concerns around the motor court between the two garages. There is now a preference for a 4 car garage instead of the currently proposed separate garages. Additionally, there is some concern about the porte-cochere and whether it is considered a parking space. There is some apprehension on the appearance and colouring of the house. The panel would like to see more work done to investigate what are the actual heritage colours of the house and to see a more sophisticated colour scheme presented. The panel suggests that the project come back with more work done on the motor court and landscape design and the proposed reflecting pool as they believe it is not as well developed as the rest of the house. The panel would also like for the city to clarify and determine whether the porte-cochere is an additional parking spot.

MOTION:

Motion was made that the applicant return to the Panel with the design development concerns addressed and a study done on the viability under the motor court. Seconded. Passed.

2. 3989 Granville St

Presentation: Alan Diamond & Damon Oriente

Mr. Diamond stated that the subject site was built in 1920 with a garage and pool, both of which have since been demolished. He requested that the Panel review and seek relaxation to the First Shaughnessy bylaw that a garage has to be placed in the backyard. The proposal is to place the garage in the front yard, to allow the homeowners to enjoy their backyard. By placing the garage in the front yard, it will mitigate some sound from Granville Street but will not have too much impact on the streetscape or on the house. Mr. Diamond noted that the neighbours residing in the property next door would prefer that the garage not be placed in the backyard, as it would interrupt the sunlight on to their property. The lane will be utilized and the gates will be maintained to keep the estate like feel. Permeable pavers or grass lock type grid would be used to allow cars to drive on the area while maintain yard space.

Mr. Oriente commented on the landscape design. He stated that the other options for the placement of the garage would result in the removal of a number of trees. Placing the garage in the front yard would preserve the gracious backyard.

Questions:

Mr. Diamond and Mr. Oriente took questions from the Panel.

The applicants responded with further information:

- The magnolia tree on site would not be impacted.
- The existing driveway paving will be replaced with either gravel or a garden.
- The secondary coach house building
- The magnolia tree south of the existing sunroom will be kept
- The proposed garage will be 28 x 22 (400 square feet)
- The sunroom is existing and was included in the 1920s drawings.

Panel Comments:

- A majority of the panel is sympathetic to the request and understands the rationale for the location of the proposed garage.
- Some members would like to see it look like an accessory building instead of just a garage, and one member would welcome suite above the garage. Additionally, some would like to see the addition of windows and more design development.
- One member would like to see the accessory building pushed even further

towards Granville street, however, another member is concerned with the visibility from neighbours.

- Some members are concerned that relaxation of this bylaw for this property would set a precedent for others.
- One member would like to see some investigation on the impact of the cherry tree on the south side by an arborist and consider some more paved space.
- There are concerns with the massing of the building in terms of its shape and form and does not believe it is balanced in terms of scale.
- There is a request for further development on the landscape design as it will draw any attention away from any new introduction to the home.

Planning Comments:

The Director of Planning has reviewed the proposal of the garage in a non-conforming location. Accessory buildings are required to be in the rear yard, however the Director of Planning has the ability to relax this, considering among other things “the impact of alternate locations on the site.” Staff is not supportive of the proposal, but recognize there are mitigating factors given the location of the house on the site.

Planning Questions:

Is the proposed location for the garage appropriate with regard to its relationship to the existing landscape and any impact it may have on the neighbouring sites?

Summary of panel comments:

Nine panel members were in favour of this project moving forward in the direction indicated by the drawings and application put forth on May 31. David Cuan and Kerri-Lee Watson opposed.

3. 3990 Marguerite Street

Presentation: Loy Leyland and Julie Hicks

Mr. Leyland stated that this pre 1940s house is currently divided into 6 suites. He feels that the existing house has no architectural merit, stylistically not part of Shaughnessy guidelines, and is oversized in terms of floor space. The proposed project plans to demolish the existing house and construct a new single family dwelling. The proposed site coverage of the new residence will be 27%, which is below the zoning guidelines. The new design will have a hip roof, be granite based, have a rough stucco finish, and be heavy in detailing. The birch tree on the property will be saved, however, the cherry tree is diseased and will be taken down.

Ms. Hicks presented the landscape design. The hedge between the neighbours will be retained and the area under the beech tree will be soft in landscape. Planting will be contained mostly to the perimeter to create an open space in the backyard. The cypress

tree is proposed for retention and the sunken patio will be modified if needed.

Questions:

Mr. Leyland and Ms. Hicks took questions from the Panel.

The applicants responded with further information:

- The ceiling height of the main floor is 9.5 feet, restoration of the house is not practical and detailing in the house is minimal and in poor shape
- The footprint of the proposed house will be bigger than the existing, however, is below zoning guidelines of site coverage.
- Panel members questioned why there are no attempts to retain the pre-1940 heritage home.

Planning Comments:

This site contains a pre-1940s home of merit. The applicant is proposing to demolish this house and propose a new single family dwelling. The heritage group, have conducted an evaluation of the house and concluded that it would be eligible to be put on the Vancouver Heritage Register as a B listed house. Planning is not supportive of this application and seeks to retain the existing house and infill.

Questions to the Panel:

The Director of Planning asks for your comments on the concept of building a new single family dwelling on this site, having regard to the FSODP and Guidelines.

Comments from the Panel:

- Many members of the panel agree that although the existing house is stylistically different than most Shaughnessy homes, it is a unique look, and retention of the home should be explored.
- The panel would like to see the preservation of this residence and even if a replacement option is to be considered, the panel does not support the current design.

Meeting adjourned at 8:18pm.