

**FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES**

**DATE:** April 24, 2014

**TIME:** 4:00 pm

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

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

Hakano Amaya	BCSLA
Donna Chomichuk	BCSLA
Linda Collins	Chair, Resident
Erika Gardner	Resident
Robert Johnson	AIBC
Benjamin Ling	AIBC
Mollie Massie	Vancouver Heritage
Alastair Munro	Resident, SHPOA
David Nelson	Resident
Kerri-Lee Watson	Resident

**CITY STAFF:**

Colin King	Development Planner
Tim Potter	Development Planner

**LIAISONS:**

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

**REGRETS:**

Dallas Brodie	Vice-Chair, Resident, SHPOA
Lori Hodgkinson	Resident
Peter Kappel	Resident, SHPOA
Lisa MacIntosh	REBGV
Frank Shorrock	Resident, SHPOA

**RECORDING**

**SECRETARY:** Dorothy Kerr

---

**ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING**

- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 1. | 1799 West King Edward (3998 Angus Drive) (Application first) |
| 2. | 1490 Balfour Avenue (Application first)                      |

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Collins called the meeting to order at 4:10 pm and noted the presence of a quorum.

Project Updates:

A summation of 2014 project updates to date:

3998 Granville St	Minor Addition to Post Date house: Approved
1054 Balfour Ave	Minor Addition to Pre-Date house: Approved
3990 Marguerite St	Temporary protection order expired April 15th 2014
1998 Cedar Crescent	New house enquiry expected
3333 Cedar Crescent	Application for retention scheme received April 24th
1263 Balfour Ave	Retention required
1075 Douglas Crescent	Retention enquiry expected
1126 Wolfe Avenue	FSADP Approved March 2014
1626 Laurier Ave	FSADP Enquiry: Application expected
3743 Cypress St	FSADP Approved April 2014
1037 W King Edward	CoV Preliminary design advice issued January 16th
3837 Hudson St	Minor Amendment approved
3750 Cartier Ave	Merit Evaluation completed April 2014: retention required for trees but not the house
1926 Cedar Crescent	Merit Evaluation completed April 2014: retention required
1426 Laurier Ave	Merit Evaluation completed April 2014: retention required
1837 W19th Ave	Merit Evaluation in process (April 2014)
3837 Osler St	New House Application expected
3738 Pine Crescent	New House Enquiry Post-Date Site: dormant
1664 Cedar Crescent	FSADP (twice): May 2014
3737 Angus Drive	Merit Evaluation in process (April 2014)
1564 Matthews Ave	Merit Evaluation completed April 2014: retention not required.
3302 Cedar Crescent	Renovation & Retention: Dormant
1645 West King Edward	New House on Post Date Site: Application expected
3809 Osler St.	New House: Application expected
1238 Balfour Ave	Application received: FSADP May 2014
1451 Angus Drive	Application received

April 24<sup>th</sup> Project Updates:

1296 The Crescent	Merit Evaluation completed April 2014: retention required
1426 Angus Drive	Application received: FSADP May 2014
1927 Hosmer Ave	Staff site visit next week

Review of minutes:

The minutes from March 13, 2014 and for April 3, 2014 were voted on and approved with revisions.

---

**The Panel considered two applications for presentation**

---

1. Address: **1799 West King Edward**  
Description: Renovation and Addition to existing Pre-date house  
Review: Application - first  
Architect: Stuart Howard Architects  
Delegation: Stuart Howard architect, Neil Robertson architect, Ron Rule landscape architect

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9 in favor, 1 against)**

---

**Planning Comments:**

Proposed renovation and addition to existing pre-date (1915) Craftsman style 3 story dwelling on First Shaughnessy Inventory. House located at the corner of Angus Drive and West King Edward Avenue. Four-square character of the house is to be retained by adding a new addition to the rear of the existing dwelling, differentiated primarily by the significant lowering of the ridge height of the addition. Alterations to the front porch of the existing dwelling reorient pedestrian entry to Angus Drive. Landscape review is still in process.

**Questions to Panel:**

1. Commentary around the general success of the landscape and architectural design proposals, particularly as they relate to the retention of the external character of the pre-date dwelling and existing landscaping on site.
2. Is the reorientation of the entry stair to the front porch sufficient rationale for the removal of existing tree in that location?
3. Should an alternative access route to the basement area to the rear be developed as current access is through the garage only?

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

Our goal is to retain and restore the existing structure. We have retained all of the existing significant architectural details. The existing porch with intricate handrails and square double columns are all being maintained and restored. Similarly the four existing dormers on the roof are being retained as is the large chimney on the east side. Because King Edward has heavy traffic and noise concerns we propose to relocate the main access to the house from King Edward to Angus Drive. We plan to put the parking under the house with a short driveway entrance from Angus.

**Landscape:**

The site is currently very dark with many overgrown cedar trees that are in poor condition. The arborist report identified a beech and one cedar tree as the only trees not compromised. The removal of the compromised trees will allow light into the property. We propose to add 39 new trees in addition to the new hedging around the property. With vehicular access from Angus the back yard opens up and allows room for a sports court and a lawn with a large area for a trampoline and lawn for croquet.

**Panel Commentary:**

The retention of this pre-date house was commended. Generally members liked the plans for this new house and noted it fits with the aims of the ODP. The Panel recognizes the challenge to retain the house and increase density with a new addition. It was commented that members would like to see more of the theme of the original house in the new addition.

There was discussion about relocating the front entrance to Angus. The King Edward entrance was the original entrance and the traditional front of the house. Some members wanted to see a stronger connection with the original entrance perhaps a view of the front facade through the trees from King Edward and a gate post. Members struggled with the new main entrance on Angus noting that the reorientation of the original King Edward entrance gives a view of the parking garage rather than the traditional front massing to the street. It was noted the new entrance requires a new curb cut in the sidewalk when lane access for parking already exists. The parking garage is not screened as per the Guidelines.

Members noted that in terms of massing the new addition seems out of proportion to the house. Members commented that the design of the east elevation is weak and needs more development and composition. On the west elevation it was noted the large patio doors appear out of character with the original house.

The importance of quality materials for the renovation and addition was noted. It was commented by many Panel members that the black shingles are too dark and that cedar shingles would be preferred.

Attempts to improve the site which is currently known for being very dark with overgrown and misshapen trees were positively received. Panel members noted the landscape plans are a big improvement to the present site as the new plans allow for more sunlight into the gardens. Concerns were expressed about the amount of impermeable surfaces (70%) being high and not leaving much room for landscape and gardens.

There were questions about the pastoral landscape legacy of the FSD street scape not being followed in this case as the driveway is now in the new Angus Drive front yard and looks directly into the garage doors.

#### **Chair Summary:**

The Panel commends the applicants for restoring this lovely old house. We are very happy to see the materials board showing the color scheme as well as samples of the materials. There is an issue with the Angus Drive entrance, particularly with driveway facing right onto the garage doors. The east elevation is the weakest and needs some work. The asphalt shingles are too dark, the Panel suggests cedar shingles would be a huge improvement as they would lighten the project and fit better into the surrounding neighbourhood. The Panel is pleased the architect will remain with the project through the construction phase.

A motion to support the project with concerns about the roof material and further design required for both the east and west elevations was passed and seconded.

---

2.	Address:	<b>1490 Balfour Avenue</b>
	Description:	Renovation and Addition to existing Pre-date house
	Review:	Application - first
	Architect:	Loy Leyland Architect
	Delegation:	Loy Leyland architect, Julie Hicks landscape architect

---

Delegation: **EVALUATION: SUPPORT (10 in favor, 0 against)**

---

**Planning Comments:**

Proposed renovation and addition to existing pre-date (1912) 2 story dwelling on First Shaughnessy inventory at the corner of Balfour Avenue and Granville Street with lane access. Proposed works include relocation and substantial basement addition to the existing pre-date dwelling, as well as the relocation and retention of an existing non-conforming coach house.

**Questions to Panel:**

1. Commentary around the general success of the landscape and architectural design proposals, particularly as they relate to the retention of the external character of the pre-date dwelling and existing landscaping on site.
2. Does the Panel have any concerns around the proposed vehicular access along the lane, especially as it relates to the retention of the coach house?

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The house will be moved 18' over and 20' forward to give more room to the back of the site. The coach house is existing and it seems like a good opportunity to retain this structure and use it with the help of gates to obscure the parking. We have closed the original driveway entrance from Granville Street due to noise and traffic issues. We have added a second driveway entrance from the lane in order to access the front yard porte cochere.

**Landscape:**

There is an existing driveway crossing on Granville street we plan to close off. We intend to retain the existing mature Portuguese laurel at the crossing and plant more Portuguese laurels so that over time the entire end of the garden will read as one unit. The house will be slightly screened with layers of planting and some foundation planting. There will be an active play area and a big open front yard with new trees for screening.

**Panel Commentary:**

Members were supportive of the retention and commended the applicant. Moving the house was supported as the new location takes advantage of the lot. The additions proposed were noted as subordinate to the original house. The coach house is a nice feature and works well in this case as a gatehouse for the underground parking. Members commented that the new driveway opening from the lane in order to use the porte cochere makes sense. Members encouraged the applicant to retain the existing stonework with its first rate craftsmanship as it is unique in FS and has wonderful character.

Design advice focused on the South elevation. The Panel commented that the South elevation feels chunky compared to the elegance of the retained house. It was mentioned that to make the South elevation more robust and in line with the strong geometry of the house the existing two little roofs could be removed so the large gable would extend into the South elevation.

**Chair Summary:**

The Panel is very pleased this beautiful heritage home is being retained. The coach house is a big hit, it is very charming and the driveway access through its gates is viewed as positive. The applicants told the Panel the architect would remain with the project through construction. The Panel was glad to hear this as the architect would be sure to maintain the high quality of building materials and construction details proposed in the Panel meeting.

A motion to support the application and commend the applicants on maintaining and restoring the house with the help of their architect was passed and seconded.

**Adjournment:** There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 5:55 pm.