FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: October 5, 2017
TIME: 4:00 pm
PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, Vancouver City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE FIRST SHAUGHNESSY DESIGN PANEL:

Frank Shorrock	Resident, SHPOA
Kathy Reichert	Resident
Mamie Angus	Resident
Pamela Lennox	Resident, SHPOA
John Madden	Resident
Mollie Massie	Vancouver Heritage Commission
Nicole Clement	Resident, SHPOA
Donna Chomichuk	BCSLA
Lu Xu	BCSLA
Tim Ankenman	AIBC

CITY STAFF

Susan Chang	Development Planner
Gavin Schaefer	Development Planner

LIAISONS:

George Affleck	City Councillor

REGRETS:

Catherine Evans	Park Board Commissioner
Melissa De Genova	City Councillor
David Cuan	Chair, Resident, SHPOA
Robert Miranda	Vice Chair, Resident
Joanne Giesbrecht	REBGV
Michael Leckie	AIBC

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gavin Schaefer

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	1812 W 19th – Conservation Proposal
2.	1625 Matthews Ave- New House

Business:

The panel elected Kathy Reichert as Acting Chair who called the meeting to order at 4:00

pm and noted the presence of a quorum.

Motion was passed to approve Robert Miranda's leave of absence.

Review of Minutes
Sept. 14, 2017: Deferred approval for next meeting. A motion was passed to invite applicant from past meeting to an optional workshop.

Project updates:
There are no project updates at this time.

The Panel considered two applications for presentation

Address:	1812 W 19th
Description:	Conservation Proposal
Review:	Second
Architect:	Wiedemann Architectural Design
Delegation:	Stefan Wiedemann, Architect, Wiedmann Architectural Design & Julie Hicks, Landscape Architect, ViewPoint

Planning Comments:
This conservation application proposes renovations and additions to an existing house built in 1912. The house, also known as Hugh Residence, is a good example of Colonial-revival architectural style for its simplified form and classical detailing, including shingled cladding, hipped roof with dormers, and full width porch with classical Tuscan columns.

Character defining elements include: Full width front porch on W 19th Ave. and side entrance porch on Pine Crescent with entrance door with stained glass light and crown, solid shingle-clad balustrade, wooden Tuscan columns; Front porch roof extending to form the porte-cochere including three Tuscan supporting columns mounted on shingle-clad piers; Shingle cladding from grade to the frieze plate including the base flare; Hipped roof with centered dormers on each elevation including the tongue-and-groove board soffit; Three brick chimneys with matching caps and concrete crown wash details; Double hung windows with wide frames including stained glass windows and transoms.

The dwelling has no lane. Proposed parking is located under the principal building, accessed from an existing crossing located on the north/east side of lot, on W 19th Ave. Proposed revision to the front steps re-directs the pedestrian circulation towards the south/east corner of the lot and separates from the vehicular circulation. Porte-cochere is proposed to be reduced /relocated in order to allow for the vehicle maneuvering. Side access on Pine Crescent to the side entry porch is proposed as removed, and replaced with low stone replacement wall behind retained existing hedge. Side entry porch is being retained.

Past comments:

- Character elements compromised or removed in particular the porte-cochere and the massing of the new addition that obscures the squre box of the Colonial revival style.
- Maintain the clarity of the front stair so that the side steps do not require railing that would impact the straight-run look of the original design when viewed from 19th Ave.

- Revisit the 4-car garage location, in particular, how a re-organization could retain the existing porte-cocher.
- Addition to be distinguishable and subordinate to the main building. The addition could be more distinct.
- Explore retaining the south dormer so that all the dormers are intact because it is a defining characteristic of the house.
- More windows should be added to the west façade of the new addition and set further back.
- Redesign the garage door with an arbour over the door and remove the arch to improve the design.

Questions to Panel:

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

Applicant's Introductory Comments:
Since last application, the main changes have had to do with the porte-cochere. The front post remains, and the whole roof is pulled forward to the existing location. Two intermediate posts have been removed to facilitate the drive aisle. From the street, the garage is not visible due to hedging. Curved garage doors have been revised. Trellis detail has been added. At the upper level, deck has been reduced, and a green roof added. Existing entry stairs have been spread out, with lower steps reduced to 3 risers to avoid railings. An east side porch has been retained with side gate access but this porch will not be used as an entry. The south dormer is revised per the panel's recommendations. Fenestration has been adjusted on both the back and on the sides. The addition is more distinct from original building by proposing a darker pigment.

Landscape:
The entry off from Pine is to add a closed gate and gateposts, versus the current opening in hedge. The gate will remain shut, with no entry on that side. On the elevation, the green roof is depicted as having planters. It is in fact a low-profile sedum roof, as there is not a lot of soil depth on the roof.
The front entry gate has been softened, as simpler, cleaner than the previous submission. This is on sheet L3.

The applicant took questions from the panel.

Panel Commentary:
- It was appreciated the porte-cochere has been kept.
- This is a tricky site, but the move to extend the existing porte-cochere is well handled. The wall behind the porte-cochere is somewhat blank, which can be addressed with a planter or a window.
- The existing house is intact from the street and the addition is subordinate to the existing house. It is a nice solution.
- Panel comments have been addressed. The blank elevation per the previous comments could use some activation. It is hoped that the existing cladding and details are not stripped when raising the house.
- The addition is a reasonable size and the garden is lovely.
- Site visit was appreciated and looks forward to the completion of this project.
- Site visit helped put the project into perspective. The proposal is appreciated, especially the front stair area. The massing is consistent with the structure of the

house and the porte-cochere has been retained.
- Landscape plan and the architectural intent is supported. The blank wall per the previous comments could be activated, possibly with a planter. The sunken backyard retaining wall could be softened and screened with shrubs.

Chair Summary:
The panel is thankful for the changes that have addressed panel comments. The porte-cochere has been maintained and massing of the addition is subordinate to the existing building. There were some concerns expressed such as the blank wall framed by the porte-cochere, which can be activated with a planter or window. Retention of the existing shingles and trim could be retained. The retaining wall of the rear yard can be softened with planting in front. Overall the addition works well.

Applicant's Response:
The applicant thanked the panel members for their constructive input. The architect will look into a way to activate the wall and retaining walls. Shingles are difficult to retain with a rain screen and insulation, as the building no longer breathes in the same way.

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8 in favour, 0 abstentions, 0 against)

Address:	1625 Matthews Ave
Description:	New Build – non protected property
Review:	First
Architect:	Raffaele & Associates
Delegation:	Trevor Toy, Raffaele & Associates & Larry Fiddler

---

Planning Comments:
This is a proposal for a new dwelling on an approximately 70'x225' lot with no lane access. It is a relatively flat site. The 3-car garage is accessed from Matthews. The application is described as Georgian Revival Style. Materials include rough stucco, stone, asphalt shingle and wood windows.

Questions to Panel:
1. Can the Panel comment on the success of the architectural proposal in particular height and composition.

2. Can the Panel on the success of the landscape proposal as it relates to the FS guidelines.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:
This is a new 21/2 storey house, replacing an existing underutilized house. Trees on site dwarf the existing house. Driveway will be retained, to access garage in the back. This is partially to not disturb the existing tree roots on the site. The main trees kept include a Spruce and Magnolia. Several trees proposed as removed, are currently in discussion with landscape and arborist.
More windows have been added in the back due to the north-facing aspect. Due to the darkness resulting from the trees, lighter colours were chosen. The trim will be white, and the house a cream colour. The ledgestone is proposed used at the base, and is a larger size due to the size of the house.

Landscape:
The main landscape element is the driveway, magnolia, spruce, and several other trees. The rest is new and proposed to filter the view from the street. Driveway gates, pedestrian gates, stone and iron fences all serve to filter further. Intent is to have a year-round activation. Listen to the recording for this one.

The applicant took questions from the panel.

Panel Commentary:

- For the most part, this is a handsomely detailed house. The colour palette is agreeable as well as the level of detail. The height far exceeds what is appropriate, given the scale of the neighbouring homes. Height can be addressed by reducing 12' ceilings on second floor, and roof pitch. The garage can be rotated 90 degrees, to improve functionality and allow for more garden area. The side stair could be reworked.
- The height of the house is excessive, and the roofline/dormers are not consistent with a Georgian house. The shape of the front door may not be a traditional Georgian shape. Per previous comment, the garage could be relocated to minimize pavement in the rear yard as well as more layering and filigree in front yard.
- Square shape/massing is great but height is excessive, and the house style is not fully Georgian Revival. Proportions and details are not consistent with the style. The roof should be a hip roof, and dormers should be more restrained. Fascia board in the middle is too tall. The window trim detailing needs to be more robust. The balcony railing above the front porch needs to be taller. In terms of the tripartite expression, the base should recede more, as it is too massive for the proposed house. The garage style can be developed. The front yard can have more layering and filigree. Lastly consideration to rework the interior stairs from the living room.
- This is a fine house, but does not fit into Shaughnessy. It is too tall and extent of stone needs to be softened.
- Previous comment regarding garage is supported. Rectilinear walkway could be curved consistent with the circular front lawn. Sunken patio including access stairs could be revisited. Garbage/ recycling could be located closer to the kitchen.
- The roof height looks tall, compared with all the neighbours. Eastern and western neighbours all have green hedges in the streetscape. The proposed height of the front fence should be confirmed. The front yard does not have enough filigree as per the guidelines. More curvilinear planting, and lawn integrated with some of the pathways is recommended. The backyard could be more usable. Stone walls can be softened with planting. Patio and driveway can also be soften with planting in
- Previous comment on height is supported. Dormers are too forward, making the house seem even taller. The north patio is likely in shadow most of the day. The landscaping plan could be less harsh to contrast with rectilinear house.
- The house needs to be toned down, and quieter. The landscape needs to be more embellished, elegant, and beautiful. It is a little on the harsh side. The back yard needs some work.

Chair Summary:
The height is not appropriate to the streetscape, and due to narrowness of lot, the height is more evident. Change in roof pitch could assist with height. The dormers are not in keeping with the Georgian style. The colour combination and materials are liked. Windows and fascia boards could be better detailed. Proportion of railings and balconies should be further explored. Base of the house could be less visually prominent and

possibly softened with another material. Railings on porches need to be softened.

More filigree is need in the front yard. The front walkway could be revised and softened, as it is too linear next to the curved garden. The garage location is impacting the use of the rear yard and could be rotated. More rear yard planting could soften the stone walls, and landscape separation should be provided between the driveway and patio. The side entry stairs, emptying to the driveway could be reworked.

Applicant's Response:
The applicants thanked the panel for their comments. The Tree Protection Zone in the rear of the site is driving the garage location. This is a difficult lot due to the narrowness of the lot, and the retention of the trees on the site. The neighbouring trees cast a good deal of shadows. The Golden Ratio was applied in terms of the proportions.

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (0 in favour, 1 abstentions, 7 against)