

**FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES**

**DATE:** November 7, 2013

**TIME:** 4:00 pm

**PLACE:** Town Hall Meeting Room 116, City Hall

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE FIRST SHAUGHNESSY DESIGN PANEL:

|                    |                             |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| Dallas Brodie      | Vice-Chair, Resident, SHPOA |
| Donna Chomichuk    | BCSLA                       |
| Linda Collins      | Chair, Resident             |
| Clinton Cuddington | AIBC                        |
| Erika Gardner      | Resident                    |
| Peter Kappel       | Resident, SHPOA             |
| Benjamin Ling      | AIBC                        |
| Lisa MacIntosh     | REBGV                       |
| Alastair Munro     | Resident, SHPOA             |
| Frank Shorrock     | Resident, SHPOA             |
| Jennifer Stamp     | BCSLA                       |
| Kerri-Lee Watson   | Resident                    |

**CITY STAFF:**

|            |                     |
|------------|---------------------|
| Tim Potter | Development Planner |
| Colin King | Development Planner |

**LIAISONS:**

|                |                 |
|----------------|-----------------|
| George Affleck | City Councillor |
|----------------|-----------------|

**REGRETS:** Michael Kluckner Vancouver Heritage

**RECORDING**

**SECRETARY:** Dorothy Kerr

---

| ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| 1.                             | 1695 Angus Drive Enquiry (2nd - Dec. 2012) |
| 2.                             | 1126 Wolfe Avenue Enquiry (1st)            |

**Business Meeting:**

Chair Collins called the meeting to order at 4:15pm and noted the presence of a quorum.

There was discussion about updating the ODP. There is a common concern between Panel members and City staff about double height ceilings in FS. Advice was heard from staff that the Administrative Bulletin issued which tried to deal with this topic does not have legal bearing and is not very helpful. The view was expressed that we might make more progress discussing over height ceilings in terms of heritage. There is a heritage report coming to Council in December, the panel discussed how we might fit our concerns in with that report. Councillor Affleck noted the controversy caused by the community plans in other neighborhoods. Councillor Affleck offered to work with Panel and staff towards developing a motion to bring before council.

**Project Updates:**

|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| 4033 Osler St.          | Not sufficient merit to retain  |
| 1998 Cedar Cres.        | Evaluated as a low C; can renovate or redevelop                                   |
| 3809 Osler St.          | Evaluated as a low C; can renovate or redevelop                                   |
| 1864 West 17th Ave.     | Coming in soon as an application to renovate                                      |
| 2071 W King Edward Ave. | Post-date site; new house design  |
| 3990 Marguerite St.     | DoP Will be referred to Council re: designation of house                          |
| 1550 Marpole Ave.       | DoP Informed applicant on need for SOS/Conservation plan as per Panel instruction |
| 1250 Wolfe Ave.         | Enquiry for renovation and addition pre-date house at November 28, 2013 FSDAP     |
| 1054 Balfour Ave.       | Enquiry for minor addition to rear of pre-date house                              |

**Review of Minutes:**

No minutes were reviewed.

---

**The Panel considered two enquiries for presentation.**

---

|    |              |                                 |
|----|--------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. | Address:     | <b>1695 Angus Drive</b>         |
|    | Description: | New house proposal              |
|    | Review:      | Second                          |
|    | Architect:   | Studio V                        |
|    | Delegation:  | Gary VanDyke<br>Jonathan Graggs |

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (11 in favor, 1 against)**

---

**Planning Comments:**

This is an application that seeks to construct a new house on a post-date site. The original house was significantly fire damaged. This is the second appearance at Panel (December 2012).

**Questions to Panel:**

1. Please comment on the overall success of the proposal as it relates to the FS ODP and Guidelines.
2. Please comment on the success of the landscape design and its overall integration with the site and its topography.

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

This is our second presentation to Panel and we have made major changes this time with respect to the siting of the house and parking. We have tried to replicate the building and to bring out the Tudor details. Previously the house had a lap siding base, the base now is stone. We are keeping the massing but tidying up some of the architectural details. We have moved the house and created additional parking under the house, we are retaining two additional parking spaces. The tennis court has been retained and the landscaping around it is being designed to echo the architecture of the house.

**Landscape:**

The principle change in our landscape plan is keeping the tennis court and deciding how to make this a beautiful thing. Currently the tennis court has painted concrete walls with a red brick court. We plan to add more steps going down into the court and low granite walls around the court. We are changing the color scheme to blue and green to blend in with the house and garden. We have retained all principal trees on the property. We have added quite a few trees to the front yard where there are currently no trees apart from the street trees.

**Panel Commentary:**

There was conversation that the building pitch has been well resolved. The house sits well on the lot and gives a good cadence to the elevation. The living quarters in the basement would be improved by widening the window wells to let in more light.

This project fits in with the ODP, but it is a shame to have so much paving in the back yard even though it cannot be seen from the street. There is an opportunity here to do something different with the back yard. This project looks better than the previous house on the site.

There was much discussion about the tennis court in the back yard being a lost opportunity because the amount of paving is very inhospitable. There are a lot of options for tennis courts such as a clay court or sand based turf that drains quickly and is more flexible than pavement. The landscaping around the tennis court could be improved.

There were comments that this project is in keeping with the broad goals for First Shaughnessy. There is support for the efforts to maintain the garage and provide additional on-site parking that cannot be seen from the street. Support was expressed for the effort to maintain the original design of the house. There was strong support for cedar shakes used for the roofing material. This project preserves and enhances the streetscape as outlined in the ODP.

The view was expressed that the existing garage does not fit with the elegance of the house, that the north windows of the garage seem unresolved.

It was discussed that the landscaping in the front yard could be improved by giving the front path a more circuitous route and by making the tree arrangement more asymmetrical and layered.

There were comments about every detail of this Tudor revival being executed with exacting detail. There was appreciation for how well the Guidelines have been embraced. The treatment of the front entry and chimneys are particularly well done. The use of high quality materials like cedar shakes and zinc gutters and down spouts is appreciated and in keeping with the estate like quality.

It was noted that this is an incomplete application with regard to materials, and a request was made that we want to see more details on the specific materials used.

**Chair Summary:**

This has been a very well received project. This handsome project is consistent with the FS ODP and the Guidelines. There is positive support for the tripartite expression on the exterior of the house. There were good comments about opening up and widening the window wells to allow more light into the basement rooms. With regard to landscaping more layering would be an improvement, particularly in the front yard where it might allow in more sun. There was huge support for the overall look of the house within the neighbourhood and for how the house sits on the lot. There is some concern about the tennis court in the back yard which presents a lot of impervious space. There are solutions to look at for the tennis court surface such as sand based turf.

The Panel wants to see a color and materials palette for this project.

Motion put forward by Clinton Cuddington to approve the project with a focus on investigating options to soften the tennis court. Motion seconded by Kerri-Lee Watson.

- 
- |    |              |                             |
|----|--------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. | Address:     | <b>1126 Wolfe Avenue</b>    |
|    | Description: | New house on Post-Date site |
|    | Review:      | First                       |
|    | Architect:   | Stuart Howard               |
|    | Delegation:  | Stuart Howard               |
|    | Landscape:   | Paul Sangha                 |
- 

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT - The enquiry was supported with the desire that any application brought to the Panel should have detailed materials and color information.**

---

**Planning Comments:**

This is a proposal for a new house on a post-date site. The site has significant change in grade from street to rear, and has no lane way access.

**Questions to Panel:**

1. Does the Panel have any preliminary feedback with regard to the proposed massing of the house on the site as it relates to the FS ODP and Guidelines?
2. Does the Panel have any preliminary feedback with regard to the extent of hard landscaping to the rear of the proposed house?

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

This site is on Wolfe Avenue just south of where 16th Avenue becomes Wolfe. This is a busy street. The existing house is an old rancher. We have tried to position the new house in approximately the same location keeping it more or less in line with the adjacent houses. There is a significant grade change from front to back of the property of 30 feet. The existing driveway almost encroaches onto the neighbor's property so part of our solution is to move the driveway over which will also shield the view into the parking area and the house. We have placed the main floor at the same level as the existing main floor, and excavated the basement along the westerly boundary. This helps us shield the view of the garage doors from the street. We pushed the mass of the house south and east therefore presenting a relatively narrow portion of the house to the street. As we progress up the hill we go from a one-story over basement massing to a more conventional two story over basement in the rear. That allows for an articulation of the roof plane that follows the slope of the lot and presents a lower mass to the street. The materials palette has a tripartite expression with a stone base and more cut stone, and the main body of the house is textured and painted brick. The roof is slate and we want to add steel windows. This project has a lot of robust detailing.

**Landscaping:**

Wolfe is a busy street which led us to the solution of creating an interior auto court. There is an entry arbor trellis arrangement as one enters the auto court. We have planned the auto court to look more like a hard surface garden than an auto court, there will be a water feature and trees. From the street the landscaping will present a layered and filtered view towards the house, there is an extensive amount of landscaping in the front yard right now.

The landscape plan is influenced by the fact that the majority of sunlight will be in the backyard where the clients would like to have a pool. At the rear of the house we stepped the property down to a family room which overlooks the pool. In the rear garden there is an outdoor kitchen, outdoor dining area and terrace.

**Panel Commentary:**

There was a positive view towards the style of the house being a variation on what we usually see in First Shaughnessy. The house design was called refreshing. This is clearly an excellent design and although it is not in the same style we usually see in First Shaughnessy we are in support of the project due to its location and the fact that some of the surrounding homes are gorgeous non traditional homes. The house as viewed from the street will be very attractive and blend into the neighbourhood as required by the FS ODP and Guidelines.

The massing and rooflines are well handled. The amount of hard landscaping in the back yard is acceptable as there is so little hard landscaping in the front yard. The terrace along the street edge is supported.

It was noted that this is an interesting site, the house fits into the surrounding area, and that the style could be called Shaughnessy eclectic.

There was concern expressed about steel windows and a suggestion that wood windows would be more in keeping with the neighbourhood. There was further discussion about the detailing of the metal window frames, that they should be thin and modernist.

The Panel supports the massing of the house and the way it is handled on the sloping property. The landscaping was described by Panel members positively, ranging from very successful to beautifully executed.

**Chair Summary:**

There was a lot of support for this proposal given the difficulty of the busy location and slope of the lot. It is refreshing to see a different style in the area. The Panel supports the massing of the house and how the it relates to the FS ODP and Guidelines. The Panel is in favor of the landscape design at the rear of the house, the landscaping follows the FS ODP and Guidelines. We would like to see samples of the metal window frames and of the brick treatment. The use of slate for the roof material was well received.

The enquiry is supported with the desire to see a color and materials board at the next application presentation.

**Adjournment:**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:30pm.