

FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: September 26, 2013

TIME: 4:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room 115, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE FIRST SHAUGHNESSY DESIGN PANEL:
 Linda Collins Chair, Resident
 Clinton Cuddington AIBC
 Erika Gardner Resident
 Peter Kappel Resident, SHPOA
 Michael Kluckner Vancouver Heritage
 Benjamin Ling AIBC
 Alastair Munro Resident, SHPOA
 Frank Shorrock Resident, SHPOA
 Jennifer Stamp BCSLA

CITY STAFF:
 Tim Potter Development Planner
 Colin King Development Planner

LIAISONS:
 George Affleck City Councillor

REGRETS: Dallas Brodie Vice-Chair, Resident, SHPOA
 Donna Chomichuk BCSLA
 Lisa MacIntosh REBGV
 Kerri-Lee Watson Resident

RECORDING SECRETARY: Dorothy Kerr

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	3837 Alexandra Street - Application
2.	1550 Marpole Avenue - Enquiry
3.	3473 Cypress Street - Enquiry

BUSINESS MEETING

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

Business:

- Councillor Affleck was to gather more information on the City's Interim Rezoning Policy which would allow rezoning on major arterial streets citywide, including in the First Shaughnessy Heritage District. Since Councillor Affleck was not present it was agreed to defer this item until the next meeting.

Project Updates:

- There were no new project updates.

Review of minutes:

- The minutes from July 25 and September 5 were voted on and approved. It was discussed that in future the minutes will be formally approved with a motion to adopt the minutes and a seconder. The minutes will then be voted on and uploaded to the City's website.

The Panel considered one application and two enquiries for presentation.

- | | | |
|----|--------------|--|
| 1. | Address: | 3837 Alexandra Street |
| | Description: | Renovation to a pre-date Heritage B house |
| | Review: | Application, second review |
| | Architect: | Benjamin Ling Architect |
| | Delegation: | Benjamin Ling Architect, Viewpoint Landscape Architects
Julie Hicks landscape architect |
-

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7 in favor, 0 against) Ben Ling recused himself from the vote

Planning Comments:

The Panel reviewed this proposal as an enquiry on August 2, 2012. This is a renovation to a pre-date existing B listed house on the Vancouver Heritage Register. The addition is largely at the rear but includes some additions to each side of the house.

Questions to Panel:

1. In general and in particular planning seeks comments on the site planning, site access, and landscape design for the proposal as they relate to the FSODP and guidelines.
2. Have the addition areas of the proposal been successfully handled? Are they sympathetic to the nature, form and massing of the existing Heritage house?

Introduction:

Tim Potter introduced the project. This is a 1910 Sam McLure house listed as B on the Heritage register.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Ben Ling noted the existing house was completed in 1910. The house is situated well back on the property by approximately 100 feet. The previous owners paved the back yard. Mr. Ling is proposing an addition of 6,000 square feet to the rear of the house. The front yard will be preserved in order to maintain the grand estate look of the property. The house will be lifted up and a new foundation built to increase the basement ceiling height to 10 feet. The rear of the house will contain the new addition and new elements.

Landscape:

Julie Hicks discussed the landscaping with its English and heritage garden aspects. The approach is to retain the perimeter trees. A new driveway will be built using paving stones, the existing asphalt driveway will be removed. The front yard landscaping will include a combination of mature rhododendrons, evergreen trees and some smaller trees such as Japanese maples to give a sense of privacy with peek-a-boo views into the yard and through to the house.

Panel Commentary:

The panel discussed the retention of original leaded windows, with some members supportive of replacement windows in the same style as the old ones to increase energy efficiency, and others of the view that as an original Heritage aspect of the project, the windows should not be altered for energy efficiency reasons. This specific debate led to a more general discussion of this issue and it was decided that this topic merits further general discussion in the future by the Panel.

The comment was made that in future projects there should be a statement of significance prepared by a qualified Heritage consultant for a project of this scope to ensure no important elements of the house are lost. The more original material retained in a house the more credibility Shaughnessy has as an authentic historic area.

Panel commentary on the roof noted that the roof is the largest uninterrupted piece of the canvas and the better the quality of roof material, the better the whole picture of the house and garden. The Panel would like to see a higher quality material than asphalt shingles for the roof. The cherry on the sundae would be a split cedar shake roof.

On the question of neighbor responses, staff informed the panel that there was one neighbor response seeking information about the kitchen addition for the kitchen, but this response did not express a negative view towards the renovation plans.

It was noted that the new renovation helps the rear of the house, where it creates a fantastic living space. Landscape proposals were noted as being really lovely, with the expression that the panel was glad the apple tree has been retained. It was noted that the hedge surrounding the front yard forms a wall at the front corner and suggested that this corner could be softened with the layering of shrubs and trees at the corner in place of the solid hedge.

Chair Summary:

The Panel commends the architect and landscape architect on this project. The massing of the house and the landscaping are handled very well. Both the architecture and landscaping follow the FSODP and Design Guidelines. This has been an incredibly good presentation, thorough and considerate. The additional massing of the house is an example of how a building can be improved with the addition of more square footage. This is a beautiful project and the Panel is very pleased that although there was the possibility to add an infill house to the property the client chose instead to retain the estate like character of the front yard and put the addition at the rear of the house.

2. Address: **1550 Marpole Avenue**
Description: Renovation to a pre-date Heritage B house
Review: Enquiry, first review
Architect: Formwerks Architectural
Delegation: Formwerks Architectural, Matt Mauza architect and
Claudia Koerner landscape architect
-

EVALUATION: NOT SUPPORTED

The panel advises staff to seek the advice of the Heritage committee on this enquiry.

Planning Comments:

The proposal is to preserve and renovate an existing Heritage B listed house at 1550 Marpole Avenue. The existing dwelling will be relocated forward of existing siting to allow additions on each wing within required setbacks. Both relocation of the existing dwelling and reconfiguration of driveway access will result in loss of existing trees. Significant trees along the street frontage will be retained.

Questions to Panel:

1. Does the Panel have any commentary regarding the loss of significant trees through relocation of the house and drive, or any comment regarding the relationship of proposed additions to the form of the existing house?

Introduction:

Colin King presented the project. This is an enquiry for a Heritage B house. The idea is to move the house forward on the site, to add to the rear of the house and to retain the many large trees along the Marpole street edge.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Matt Mauza outlined the plan to retain the character of the facade of the house while building a new house behind the facade with a modern solarium at the rear of the house. The existing Heritage B house was built in 1919 and is named White Gates Lodge. The house has been renovated a couple of times for rentals and a care facility.

Landscape:

Claudia Koerner explained that some of the large trees in the front yard are up to 25 meters tall. The lot presents the generosity and lavishness of a park like setting. The back yard lacks character and looks abandoned; more trees will be planted in the back yard. Due to the new location of the house there will be some unfortunate loss of a strong group of trees in the front yard.

Panel Commentary:

The panel considered some aspects of the proposal successful: the proposal to push the house forward opening up the back yard allowing it to breathe; the modern fenestration on the south elevation.

With regard to landscaping, the loss of trees is lamented but it may be necessary for this project. There is one significant tree in the stand of front yard trees near the house, and also a walnut tree that the panel would like to see retained. It was noted there are underground streams flowing through this property and a hydrologist report should be required

Significant discussion centered on the retention efforts and the heritage aspects of the proposal. The view was expressed that the original house is all but destroyed; the amount of double height space inserted into the interior makes a mockery of the idea of 'renovation' and completely ignores the essential nature of the First Shaughnessy Design Guidelines and intent, let alone the principles underpinning the City's heritage program. Further comment was made that this is not a retention effort, but rather new build construction with the retention of the façade only and not appropriate for a Heritage B dwelling. The view was expressed that the proposed design pays a disservice to the existing house and turns it into something that speaks more to bureaucracy than it does to fresh design.

Design commentary focused on the institutional look of the proposed house: that it looks like an apartment building and is not a good fit for the First Shaughnessy district; that the front design of the house looks mundane and lacks life and energy; that the uniform height of the building appears boring and the building might be improved by varying the roof heights.

Concern was expressed over the narrow side yards created through the relocation: the side yards are very narrow for a house of this size and the design of the house might be improved by moving the two sides to the rear of the property.

Chair Summary:

This is an enquiry so the applicant is looking to us for ideas and suggestions and we have had lots coming forward from retaining some of the trees to varying the roof heights. There was a comment about the house looking like an apartment building and not being a good fit for the FSD. The back yard needs strong trees as well as the front yard to tie the project together. There were other comments about the house looking like a care facility. We cannot move forward with the project in its current state.

A statement of significance should be required for any future proposals for this Heritage B house and the panel would like to see it again as an enquiry with a more meaningful level of retention proposed.

3.	Address:	3473 Cypress Street
	Description:	New house on a post-date site
	Review:	Enquiry, first review
	Architect	J & R Katz Design and Architecture
	Delegation:!	Jonathan Katz and David Rose landscape architect

EVALUATION: SUPPORT The panel wants to see this house come back to us as an application with issues addressed.

Planning Comments:

The proposal is for a new house on a post-date site. The site exhibits significant changes in grade resulting in minor technical issues to do with height, particularly on the Hosmer Street elevation. Staff and applicant team have tried to balance the desire for form of development expressed in the ODP with unusual site attributes.

Questions to Panel:

1. Does the panel have any commentary regarding the form of development, particularly with respect to proposed heights on the Hosmer Street elevation?

Introduction:

Colin King introduced the project. This is an unusual site in terms of topography. This is a new house on a post-date site. This is an enquiry and staff are interested in the panel's comments.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Jonathan Katz explained that in terms of massing this building is fairly compatible with adjacent properties. We tried to keep the design as close to the FSODP as possible. This is a steeply sloping site and was a design challenge which we think we have resolved. In terms of materials the body of the house is stucco with some shingles on the gables and split face granite for the chimneys and possibly some for the base as well. The roof is asphalt shingles and rain gutters will be zinc.

Landscape:

David Rose outlined a water feature consisting of a reflecting pool outside the main living space. The front and back gardens are connected with a walkway going around the house. The existing landscape consists of large hedges along Hosmer and Cypress Streets, we plan to take these out and replace the hedge with a granite wall with a hedge behind the wall.

Applicable Commentary from the Panel:

Regarding the technical height issue, the comment was made that the height of the building should not be determined from the outer corners of the lot but rather from the four corners of the building setbacks. This method would allow the house more height.

In discussion of the design, there were comments about the 'eyebrow' design in the roof looking forced; that the panel wants to see a higher quality roofing material than asphalt shingles; that the wood trim around the windows is not heavy enough and looks flimsy; and that the rear elevation gable is quite weak. The comment was made the house could use a stronger base such as stone for more of a tripartite look.

Regarding landscape, the view was expressed that the large hedges of rhododendrons and other plantings along Hosmer Street should be retained as this one of the nicest pieces of landscaping in the City.

Chair Summary:

We want to see this project back as an application with issues addressed. We do not see any deal breakers in the house design but would like to see it come to life. We are in favor of the landscape treatment with exception of replacing the hedges along Hosmer Street with a granite wall; we would like to see the current landscaping along Hosmer Street retained.

Adjournment

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