

FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: January 18, 2018
TIME: 4:00 pm
PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, Vancouver City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE FIRST SHAUGHNESSY DESIGN PANEL:

Erika Gardner	Resident, SHPOA
Kathy Reichert	Resident (Chair)
Michael Leckie	AIBC
Pamela Lennox	Resident, SHPOA
John Madden	Resident (Vice Chair)
Diane Kunic-Grandjean	REBGV
Mollie Massie	Vancouver Heritage Commission
Nicole Clement	Resident, SHPOA
Lu Xu	BCSLA
Dean Gregory	BCSLA
Vacant	AIBC
Richard Sirola	Resident, SHPOA

CITY STAFF

Susan Chang	Development Planner
Gavin Schaefer	Development Planner

LIAISONS:

REGRETS: Catherine Evans	Park Board Commissioner
George Affleck	City Councillor
Melissa de Genova	City Councillor
Frank Bailly	Resident
John Wang	Resident

RECORDING SECRETARY: Camilla Lade

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 2003 W 19th
2. 1080 Wolfe Ave

Business Meeting

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

Business:

- Welcome new and returning members.
- Election of a new chair:

- Kathy Reichert was elected Chair.
- John Madden was elected Vice-Chair.
- Terms of Reference:
 - General Procedure
 - Quorum
- Review of Minutes from October 26, 2017 – passed.
- Discussion:
 - 3737 Angus: House is salvageable. 2 violation orders have been sent; last deadline was Jan. 5. Consultants have been engaged to erect a temporary structure to protect the property and to remediate.
 - Heritage presentation rescheduled: will wait for Marco's replacement; Susan will see if anyone else in Planning could make presentation.
- 2017 year end project summary
 - 1388 Laurier Ave, New Build - non-protected property
 - 1099 Wolfe Avenue, New Build - non-protected property
 - 1190 Matthews Avenue, New Build - non-protected property
 - 1037 West King Edward Ave, New Rental Multiple Dwellings - non-protected property
 - 1341 Matthews Ave New Build - non-protected property
 - 1093 Wolfe Ave New Build - non-protected property
 - 1695 Pine Crescent Conservation Proposal
 - 1299 West King Edward Ave New Build - non-protected property
 - 3789 Pine Crescent Conservation Proposal
 - 3837 Alexandra Street Conservation Proposal
 - 1812 W. 19th Ave Conservation Proposal
 - 1080 Wolfe Ave Conservation Proposal
 - 1625 Matthews Ave New Build - non-protected property
- 13 Projects reviewed: 7 New Build Proposals, 5 Conservation Proposals & 1 rental MD.
 - 11 were supported. 2 will be returning to Panel.
 - 5 meetings cancelled. 4 due to lack of quorum and 1 due to lack of projects.
- Project Updates:
 - 1296 Wolfe- Development application submitted: Alterations and change of use to childcare facility for 16 children.
 - 3809 Osler – Development application submitted: conservation proposal.
 - 1951 W. 17th Development application for replacing hedge with stone wall/wrought iron fencing.
 - 1288 The Crescent- MA for rear pool.

The Panel considered two applications for presentation

Address:	2003 W 19 th
Description:	New Build-non protected property
Review:	First
Architect:	Wiedemann Architectural Design
Delegation:	Stefan Wiedemann, Architect, Wiedemann Architectural Design Anja Slusarzick Seibt, Architect, Wiedemann Architectural Design

Donna Chomichuk, Landscape Architect,
Austin Zhou, Owner

Planning Comments:

This is a proposal for a new Tudor style 2 ½ storey dwelling with detached 3 car garage accessed from the lane. The site is approximately 92' x 125' corner lot at Maple St. and W. 19th Ave. There is an approximate 7' drop from the east to west side of the property. Materials include asphalt roof, stucco cladding with timbered detailing, and split face granite base.

1. Please comment on the success of the architectural expression relative to the First Shaughnessy Guidelines and in particular tripartite expression at the East/Maple St. elevation.
2. Can the Panel comment on the success of the landscape proposal as it relates to the FS guidelines and in particular the front yard?

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The applicant introduced the project as a small site. The proposed architecture is Tudor style with a tripartite expression. Granite is proposed for the base and first storey. The proposed height does not maximize the allowable height for the area. The façade is set back to increase the front yard and open up the corner towards the street. The materials are traditional materials with heavy timber, high quality metal work, and wood frame windows. The proposed garage is moved to the low side of the site, off the street face accessible from the lane. The proposal echoes classic examples of First Shaughnessy, such as two sided chimneys. A large roof deck from the master bedroom is proposed, as well as asphalt shingles.

Landscape:

The proposed garden is an English garden style. The side yards are planned with a garden expression. A focal point would be a small urn that is visible from the interface with the street, and leads to the front entrance. There are magnolias proposed in the front. The site faces two streets, and traditional proportions to the fencing brought around the side for a second gate. On the side of the site there is a side yard on the Maple Street side. There are soft filigree trees proposed on the Maple Street side. The other side yard is more 'naturalised' with a view of the garden from the house. The hedge level is stepped down.

The applicant then took questions from the panel.

Panel Commentary:

The Tudor style is appreciated as well as the massing and the 2 ½ story expression. The window glazing lights should be more vertical than square, using golden mean 5/8 rule. The railings styles should be consistent throughout the proposal. Consideration should be given to extend gable roof further to Maple St, mimicking west end of that roofline.

The proposed Tudor style house is not overbearing on this small site. Massing is broken too much on Maple St. Elevation. The window composition should be re-considered. The muntins appear to be misrepresented graphically as they appear too thick. However, the model appears to have a finer profile. The tripartite composition is successful. The chimneys add to the overall composition.

The chimney on the north face may block views. The landscape plan is appreciated. The back yard is well-defined. Along the street, the fence posts appear taller than 6' on this sloping site.

The muntin proportions could use some adjustment echoing previous comments. The railing is too busy. Tudor style, tripartite expression and monochromatic colours are appreciated.

It is a lovely landscape. The pavement segments at the front entry, is a modernist move which is not consistent with the house. A simpler gesture could be applied.. The entry on 19th Ave is

generous, but the paving could be widened to provide a more generous entry. Additional interest in the space could be added with planting. Exterior rooms created are lovely but transitioning between rooms could be more elegant. Simplify the paving band and consider using a clay brick rather than a concrete paver. The entrance from 19th Ave could be strengthened with filigree tree(s). The fountain design could be strengthened but appreciate the gate way. Consider the addition of a small tree by the house to be viewed from the side entrance.

The small windows are a little austere. The house and green landscaping are appreciated.

The house is appreciated as well as the colour scheme. The roof dropping at the west side is supported as it is less dominant. Windows appear a bit busy.

Maintenance due to lack of sunshine on this lot may be a future issue. The garden on the south side could be enhanced.

The greys in the colour scheme and model are appreciated. The house is supported.

The gable roof continued along Maple is preferred to make the house more prominent.

Chair Summary:

- The Tudor style and monochromatic, subtle colouring is appreciated.
- The window pane composition needs work, specifically the proportions and scale of muntins.
- Some panel members recommended exploring the massing, with specific consideration to simplify the upper roof form, extending roofline more toward Maple, mimicking roofline on west side gable.
- The landscape proposal was appreciated with minor changes to the pavers, front entrance opening, and filigree tree at Maple St. entry.

Applicant's Response:

The applicant thanked the panel for their advice.

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (10 in favour, 0 abstentions, 0 against)

Address: 1080 Wolfe Ave
 Description: Conservation Proposal
 Review: Second
 Architect: J & R Katz Design + Architecture Inc.
 Delegation: Jonathan Katz, architect, J & R Katz Design
 David Rose, Landscape Architect, PD Group

Planning Comments:

This conservation application proposes revisions and additions to an existing Heritage B house built in 1912.

The original house is a Tudor revival style house, originally designed by Samuel Maclure.

Character defining elements of the existing house include:

- Prominently sited on upper plateau of a hill;
- Original Tudor revival house with symmetrical elevations;
- Large 4 gabled roof with prominent overhangs, exposed soffits, and substantial knee brackets.
- Off-centre recessed front entry porch;
- Stone foundation and granite stone base, including original granite retaining wall at front of plateau;

- Shingled ground floor with stuccoed and half-timbered second floor;
- Original window locations;
- Serpentine driveway to the 2 car garage at the rear of site.

The site has a lower and upper plateau condition separated by a granite retaining wall. The existing garage is located at the rear of the property accessed by a serpentine driveway that cuts in front of the existing house and around the back. The parking is proposed located in the basement setback at the front allowing a separation of pedestrian and car access.

Past Panel comments suggested the addition is too large and should be less overpowering on the site. Some panel members would prefer the house sited further setback from the edge of the plateau. Others felt strongly the house should not be moved. It was felt that the addition is too close to the main house. The proposal in the details is overwhelming and not compatible with the existing house. The pool building and pool is in the wrong location. The yards are not connected and (note) not easily accessible. Yards are only accessible through the house.

Questions to Panel:

1. Does the revised proposal sufficiently address previous panel commentary?

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Significant design changes were made after the last panel as well as from feedback from Planning. The entire building was moved back 4 feet from the previous proposal to provide more space at the entrance. The scale and massing of the addition was reduced. The upper third floor was removed and replaced with access stair hatch and roof deck which is hidden behind the existing heritage building. The addition on the upper floor is thinned out to increase the separation in the proposal. There is a bridge that connects the two buildings. The height and roof of the addition has been lowered. The overhangs on the addition have been reduced to make more space between the addition and the existing house. The form of the addition has been simplified. The solarium has been re-designed to be more compatible with the main house. The main overhang of the proposed addition has been reduced to reduce the scale. The exterior finishes are 'better' articulated. The upper floor is stucco and the lower floor would be matching stone to the existing house. Two green roofs have been included. The pool area has been reduced and is now a "natural pool."

Landscape:

The driveway has been relocated. There is more separation between the walkway and the main entrance and the driveway itself. By narrowing the planter bed, the stairs have been moved to the east. There is a proposed terrace planting along the driveway. There is a stairway link to the driveway to the pool terrace. The driveway entry has been aligned with the pedestrian entry. The corner has been eased. The walkway has been retained. The existing planting has been retained in the proposal or re-located when appropriate. The pool area has been changed to a 'natural' swimming pool with an irregular shape in feel and allows planting at the pool. The plantings filter the water of the pool. The glass railings have all been removed in the current proposal. A stone wall is proposed at the front of the site.

The applicant then took questions from the panel.

Panel Commentary:

The comments have been addressed, and the proposal is stronger architecturally. The challenge is adding so much floor area. The use of the front yard with pool and pool house is not supported however it is not visible from the street due to landscaping. The house being pushed back is appreciated, as the house prominence has been maintained. Large extent of glass railing is not appropriate as it does not recede. New addition is more appropriate. The horizontal elements could be more robust. The painted MDF soffits on the addition might not be the right fit. The proposal is much improved.

The line of magnolia trees along the driveway is too formal and not consistent with the

guidelines. Consider a less formal mix of trees. Consider clay pavers instead of concrete pavers. Consider any bird friendly elements for the design such as a grid of dots on the windows.

Pool and garage is supported as it is not visible. Consider softening the retaining wall with plantings because it resembles a 'fortress'. Create more consistency between the heritage home and the addition, with the design, shape and materials. Use plantings to soften the house and addition.

Use the landscaping to soften the heavy massing. Previous comments have been addressed.

Garage was not worth saving. -(do not recall this comment?) Pool is in the shade.

Would recommend blend the new with existing house in particular the window treatment.

The balustrade on top of the retaining wall should be more consistent with the original house style. The lower front yard should have more filigree, more layered planting in front of the tall wall. The swimming pool is 5' deep. Plants can filter a more shallow depth towards the tree side.

This is a difficult site. Pool in the front yard is not visible from the street. Mature landscaping retained is appreciated. Extension has a significant amount of glass.

Glad the FSR is reduced from the previous submission. Application is stronger and quieter. The paint scheme is more compatible with existing house. Although normally beyond the scope of heritage retention, would recommend keeping the living hall and staircase. There is too much on the site at the expense of the grandeur of the heritage house and the estate like character of the landscaping. The pool house is supportable. The railing (at entry) on top of the stone wall is too massive. Current design detracts from the front of the heritage house; should be changed to be more in keeping with the style of the heritage building. The entry doors in the stone wall should be smaller and designed to be more consistent with the style of the heritage house. Limit the amount of glass on the addition. Addition still seems quite big and the two buildings still compete. Pool and pool house is supported.

Chair Summary:

It is a challenging site and (the) all comments from the previous panel were addressed.

- The glass railings should be metal or wrought iron
- Architecturally the proposal was improved
- There should be more plantings around the retaining wall and new addition to soften their appearance
- More filigree around the wall
- The balustrade above the retaining wall should be more in keeping with the heritage house
- The natural pool was supported
- The doorway to the pool through the retaining wall could be changed to be more in keeping with the heritage façade
- The old and new are working well together
- The magnolias along the pathway could be replaced with a mixture of trees
- Consider clay pavers instead of concrete
- Add fritted glass or otherwise for protection for birds
- Concerns about too much on the site at the expense of the grandeur of the house and estate-like experience

Applicant's Response:

The applicants thanked the panel for their comments, and noted the comments were meant to be addressed while trying to balance the needs of the client.

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5 in favour, 1 abstentions, 4 against)