

FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: October 26, 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
Joanne Giesbrecht REBGV
Mollie Massie Vancouver Heritage Commission (Excused from Item)
Nicole Clement Resident
Lu Xu BCSLA
Tim Ankenmen AIBC
Donna Chomichuk BCSLA – abstained from commentary and vote

CITY STAFF

Susan Chang Development Planner
Ji-Taek Park Development Planner

REGRETS: Catherine Evans Park Board Commissioner
Melissa de Genova City Councillor
David Cuan Resident, SHPOA
Robert Miranda Resident
Michael Leckie AIBC

LIAISONS:

George Affleck City Councillor

RECORDING

SECRETARY: Camilla Lade

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 1138 Richelieu Ave

Business Meeting

The panel nominated Acting Chair John Madden who called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm and noted the presence of a quorum.

- **Minutes:**
 - Approval of September 14th – tabled to next meeting
 - “the glass side plants are unacceptable” (should be added)

- “The yards are not The yards are only accessible through the house”.
- Approval of October 5th Minutes
 - “An east side porch has been retained with side gate access but this porch would not be used as an entry”
 - Pg. 4 “Due to the darkness resulting from trees (remove with) lighter colours were chosen”
 - Pg. 4 last paragraph “The balcony railings” (not just balcony)
- **Discussion:**
 - 3737 Angus
 - i. Panel noted that houses are being used as ‘party’ houses and by squatters without apparent City intervention
 - ii. Susan Chang agreed to follow up with enforcement of standards of maintenance and squatting issues with the property use inspection branch
 - Transformers in the front yard – the City cannot intervene in transformer locations currently
 - Heritage presentation rescheduled
- **Project updates:**
 - 1626 Laurier – MA – backup generator
 - 3809 Osler Street- Development application submitted: addition

The Panel considered two applications for presentation

Address: 1138 Richelieu Ave
Description: New Building- no protected property
Review: First
Architect: Farpoint Architectural Inc.
Delegation:

Planning Comments:

This is a proposal for a new dwelling on an approximately 70’/85’ x 160’ double fronting, mid-block lot along Richelieu Ave and Wolfe Ave. There is a significant drop of approximately 25’ from Wolfe to Richelieu. Parking is located in the Richelieu front yard and accessed from an existing curb cut. The design is described as an updated version of a “Four Square” style and materials include asphalt roof, stucco cladding, masonry clad base with metal clad porch and accent roofs. Alternate materials are noted but not confirmed.

Questions to Panel:

1. Can the panel comment on Architectural expression and materiality, relative to the First Shaughnessy Guidelines in addition to general comments?
2. Can the Panel comment on the success of the landscape proposal as it relates to the First Shaughnessy guidelines and in particular the front yard?

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The original planner on the project noted that frontage would be on Wolfe Avenue due to parking and setback restrictions. It is a steeply sloping sight, so parking location was limited. Later, however, Richelieu was decided by Planning could be the frontage. The site is the most difficult due to conflicting challenges and a solution was sought that would meet the guidelines. The other houses on the street have the same parti. The side yard was addressed. The garage was intended to be moved ‘out of the way’. The hope is three relaxations on the proposal. The applicant noted that the design was updated to the owner’s taste. The roof is hipped in all directions, so that it

would not obstruct views. The request is 4 more feet to make the attic space 'works' better. It is a single storey massing. Side yards were prescriptive.

The applicant noted that the project is under the footprint that is allowed and noted the rationale behind the proposed footprint.

Landscape:

The property is currently more like a 'suburban wood lot' rather than a Shaughnessy lot. There is a metal fence and brick work proposed. There is a large paving area in the entry. The driveway ramps up in the beginning, so stairs were proposed. There are curved edges proposed to soften the space and plantings to buffer the house. The intention is a plaza within a garden. There are challenging side yards, and the attempt is provide more access. There are retaining walls proposed at the rear with a metal work on stone wall with a hedged gate on it and a sloping lawn. There is more of a gardening experience. There are mature trees intended to be retained, but the large maples are planned to be removed because they are in bad shape. Replacement trees are planned to be planted and create more of a Shaughnessy garden. In lieu of adding a wall, it is requested that support for removing the trees.

The applicant then took questions from the panel.

Panel Commentary:

Tim

It is a difficult site mostly due to the slope. The constraints might be driven by a three car garage. It seems that the By law is working against the proponent. The house can be lowered. There would be less forecourt, more usable back yard, and the height would be more congruous with the existing streetscape. The question is what happens to the third car. The garage door could be finely articulated.

The house is elegant with simple proportions and the relaxations are supported. The vast windows under the dormers are too much. The streetscape elevation along Wolfe makes a lot of sense. The window in the garage facing Richelieu needs more work, and could use more detail to better articulate the window.

Lu Xu

The Richelieu streetscape looks too high. The stairs to the main floor call for a different grain of material to pave the front yard. The port cochere is too tight with the planter. Orient the stairs differently to create more space for residents in the lawn area. The Wolfe streetscape could use more trees on the upper planter level rather than the lower level.

Mollie

The boxy shape is appreciated. The wall doors are liked. The one on the northwest side might be too large. Consider using black steel on the windows. It might be too much articulation on a simple style that has impact. It needs to be simplified. Add more filigree to the front. The front entrance needs softening. The roof lines need to be revisited. More of a bellcast rather than overhangs is recommended. The roof is out of proportion. The front windows on the basement level detract from the beauty of the design. The chimneys could use something to dress them up.

Mamie

It is a nice design. The project is supported in all ways, and the request for relaxation are supported. The forecourt in the front should be addressed. The street is neglected and it will improve it.

Pamela

A lot of trees are going to be removed, but there is a lot of hardscape and little greenery.

The roof peak is quite high. It will be the tallest house on the street and might detract from the street.

Kathy

The garage and the parking is very difficult. The tri-partite expression is detracted from with the large windows. The windows could be moved to view the base. The look from the street is not of the pastoral look from the front yard. There could be some way that the front could be softened. The skylight is visible from Wolfe. The chimneys could match other homes. The different use of materials is welcomed. The asphalt could be something more modern. The house does appear high and bulky. Changing some of the relaxation might change the height.

Frank

The front steps are too long. The garage takes away from the house. The front yard should not be paved. The height should be reduced a little. The scrub trees at the back should be removed.

Chair Summary:

- the recommendation is that the garage be removed
- the house is an improvement the streetscape
- windows both on the basement level and main level could be treated
- there were questions as to whether needs to be access to Wolfe
- there were questions as to whether the house should be moved
- many on the panel recommended the height be lower
- the front yard should have additional filigree and layering when possible
- the design could be simplified with not as much articulation

Applicant's Response:

The applicant thanked the panel and noted the main concern is the tree and that the building has to be above grade. And appreciated the input from the panel and apologized for the process.

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations (5 in favour, 1 abstentions, 2 against)