

FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: January 26, 2017

TIME: 4:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, Vancouver City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE FIRST SHAUGHNESSY DESIGN PANEL:

Kathy Reichert	Chair, Resident
Mollie Massie	Vancouver Heritage
Frank Shorrock	Resident, SHPOA
David Cuan	Resident, SHPOA
Joanne Giesbrecht	REBGV
Lu Xu	BCSLA
Donna Chomichuk	BCSLA
John Madden	Resident*
Mamie Angus	Resident
Pamela Lennox	Resident, SHPOA
Nicole Clement	Resident, SHPOA
Tim Ankenmen	AIBC*
Robert Miranda	Resident

CITY STAFF:

Susan Chang	Development Planner
Ji-Taek Park	Development Planner

LIAISONS:

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

REGRETS: Michael Leckie AIBC
Melissa de Genova City Councillor
Catherine Evans Park Board Commissioner

RECORDING

SECRETARY: Camilla Ladd

*Denotes absence for a portion of the meeting.

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 1388 (1390) Laurier Ave

Business Meeting

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

Business:

- Welcome to the new and returning members.
- Election of a new chair:
 - David Cuan was elected Chair.
 - Robert Miranda was elected Vice-Chair.
- Terms of Reference:
 - General Procedure
 - Quorum
- Review of Minutes of Sept. 22, 2016 – passed.
 - Clarification on tree removal concerns relating to garage location.
 - Discussions limited to comments per terms of reference.
- Discussion:
 - Landscape presentation to be rescheduled. Rezoning/DE process to be scheduled prior to relevant project presentation.
 - Minutes to be included with agenda.
 - Panel request that agendas sent to members with each package prior to each meeting also include Planning overview and questions to be addressed by the panel.
 - Chair summary of projects to reflect consensus concerns to be addressed in future Business updates if requested.

2016 year end project summary:

1263 Balfour Avenue	Conservation
2051 West King Edward Avenue	New House
1961 Cedar Crescent	Conservation
1975 West 18 th Avenue	New House
1638 Angus Drive	Conservation
1655 Angus Drive	Conservation
1227 West King Edward	New House

- Seven projects reviewed: four new houses and 3 conservation projects.
- All seven projects were supported.
- In 2016, there were thirteen meeting cancellations: three to lack of quorum and ten due to lack of projects. Adjusting to new regulations may be a factor in the reduced number of projects.

Project Updates:

1227 West King Edward Ave	New house - approved w/conditions.
1288 The Crescent	Minor amendment to a new house
1988 Cedar Crescent	Minor amendment to a new house
3890 East Boulevard	A rear addition to a post-date house.
1190 Matthews St	Application received for new house.
1099 Wolfe	Application received for new house.
1341 Matthews	A new house on non-protected property.
1037 West King Edward Ave	Application for High Density Rental project.
1299 West King Edward Ave	Application received for a new house.
2051 West 19th Ave	Minor amendment to convert a garage to a cabana to post-date house

The Panel considered one application for presentation

Address: 1388 Laurier Ave
Description: New build on non-protected property
Review: Third
Architect: Loy Leyland
Delegation: Loy Leyland Architect and David Thompson Landscape Architect

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (10 in favor, 1 abstentions, 0 against)

Planning Comments:

This is a proposal for a new dwelling on a 99' by 100' lot with no lane at the southeast corner of Laurier Ave and Cartier Street. Parking is accessed from an existing crossing via Cartier Street. This application was presented to Panel in April of 2015 prior to new regulations.

The application is described as reflecting the Arts & Crafts and Tudor styles demonstrating a formal symmetry with materials including cedar shingles, beveled siding with half timbering details to the body of the house and a granite base. Comments from previous proposal were concerned with width of the building, seeking a more prominent entry, quality materials, sunken patio and a simplification of garden design.

Questions to Panel:

1. Does the revised proposal sufficiently address previous panel commentary?
2. Can the panel comment on the success of the architectural and landscape design proposal as they relate to the expectations of the First Shaughnessy guidelines?

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The applicant introduced the project as the third presentation to panel, and has responded to panel concerns from the previous presentation. The existing driveway is bifurcated, split by a tree, will be retained and the proposal includes a detached garage retaining the neighbour's tree. The proposal has a tripartite expression in an Arts and Crafts style in traditional materials. The chimney was removed in the design, larger roof and front porch than before. Panel comments were addressed in the design rationale.

Landscape:

The landscape changes are a response to the changes in the architecture. The garage is closer to the front than before. Moving the garage farther from the street will create more hard surface and yard will be lost. The design is in adherence with guidelines and functional uses for residents.

Panel Commentary:

The panel thanked the applicant and overall agreed it has addressed comments from the past meeting. Some members thought the garage access needed improvement while others appreciated that it screened the garage. One panel member agreed with the garage location aligning with the house. A few panel members recommended the garage doors and hardware should be in a more customized style with period accents, and carriage door should be provided.

The increased height, roof, stonework, vocabulary and use of materials is an improvement. The South façade should be organized to be symmetrical in balance with the rest of the house. The cedar shakes are an improvement and has more character. Traditional window proportions and divisions could be provided. Three central windows could have 2 vertical proportioned side windows flanking a centre window. One member mentioned that the oval windows were too

'whimsical' and out of place and would prefer there were no divider lights in the transom above the front porch door. Sauna can be relocated to allow an open window at the South façade and an outdoor entrance to the nanny suite in the basement.

The front landscape proposal was considered too formal and needs to be loosened up to capture the pastoral character of First Shaughnessy. Unfortunately, the proposed front porch reduced the front yard setback, so perhaps the front porch could be reduced in length. A substantial and varied tree canopy would be preferred as one species of columnar is proposed. Planting can be more pastoral, selectively framing and revealing the building. Reducing paved walkway all around the house could assist with pastoral image. Gate appeared too utilitarian and could be more customized.

Chair Summary:

The Chair thanked the applicant for their presentation. He noted it is an improved, organized and handsome iteration. Opinions about garage access were split. It should be 'straight in' or where it is situated in the current design to accommodate the tree. The garage doors could be improved with a more customized design. Rear elevation could be tweaked to be symmetrical in keeping with other facades. The height of the house is more attractive and in keeping with the Shaughnessy character. The change of the wall cladding from stucco to cedar is welcomed. Panel members favoured more detailing and more subdivision of the windows for interest. The basement layout could be improved to make the nanny space more livable by providing private outdoor space. Landscaping on the front is too formal and symmetrical. Asymmetry should be introduced for landscaping and perhaps the front entrance of the building. The Chair hoped the comments of the panel be considered by planning in the approval of the permit. Finally, most of the panel would favour the garage in the current design proposal.

Applicant's Response:

The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments and thought they were appropriate.