

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel Minutes

Date March 31, 2022
Time 4:00 pm
Place WEBEX / Vancouver City Hall

			Present
Members	Frank Bailly	SHPOA	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Shawn Blackwell	AIBC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Dwayne Cahill	Resident	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Nicole Clement	SHPOA	<input type="checkbox"/>
	James Evans	VHC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Tom Everitt	REBGV	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Maciej Golaszewski	BCSLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Alexa Gonzales	BCSLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Vik Khanna	Resident	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Joel Massey	VHC	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Adrian McGeehan	AIBC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Kathy Reichert	Resident	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Richard Sirola	SHPOA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Rattan Bagga	Resident	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	Alternate		
	Vice-Chair		
	Chair		
Liaisons	Colleen Hardwick	Councillor	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Brenda Clark	Staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Ryan Dinh	Staff	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Susan Chang	Staff	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Kathy Cermeno	Staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Recording		

Business

1. Welcome
2. Business Arising (Appointments)
3. Approval of minutes of February 17, 2022

Reviewed items

Item 1 3637 Cedar Crescent

EVALUATION SUPPORT (UNANIMOUS)

Description Addition - protected property Proposal
 Review First
 Applicant Piers Cunnington, Architect (Measured Architecture)
 Delegation Don Luxton Associates, Paul Sangha Landscape Architects

Introduction **3637 Cedar Crescent**

Planning Comments:

This application proposes renovation of and addition to the Mason (Ross) Residence, a two and a half storey home in the Colonial Revival Foursquare style. The house is protected with 'high' heritage merit as evaluated by Luxton and Associates, due to historical value as well as a very high degree of exterior and interior preservation.

The house is visually prominent from Cedar Crescent, with a square plan with a hipped roof, hipped dormers on the front and rear, and a mix of siding types. Some prominent exterior features include:

- Intact existing roof which maintains the original orientation, composition, and shape;
- Wide eaves with dentil coursing and carved brackets;
- a central projecting stepped porch with stained glass side lites and Doric columns;
- a second floor stepped balcony above the porch, accessed by stained glass doors from the interior staircase landing;
- Bellcast cedar shingles with dentil coursing and bellyband between lapped wooden siding at the basement level;

With the exception of the kitchen and bathrooms, the interior spaces retain a high degree of originality, with features such as:

- main staircase featuring balustrade with keyhole motif, bull-nosed bottom step, dropped newel post, and U-shaped curve on second floor balustrade;
- landing between main and second floor features bull-nosed steps to stained-glass patio doors;
- coffered ceilings with fluted beams and wooden brackets;
- wooden posts and brackets throughout, including the basement;
- original panelled wood doors (including pocket doors) and hardware;
- wood trim, hardwood floors, wainscotting and full wall panelling;
- radiators;
- fireplaces with full-height wood mantels;
- built-in window seat in the family room and built-in seating in the basement on either side of the fireplace.

To keep stonework and chimneys intact, the building is retained in its existing location, and drops the basement floor while maintaining the original ridge height. A second story addition is proposed on the south above a projecting bay currently under an open upper level deck. The proposed addition is shown under an extension to the primary roof, which increases the building width along Cedar Crescent. Other proposed changes include substituting granite for the existing wood stairs, alterations to the entry porch to accommodate a new interior stair, and revisions to the upper level balcony. Proposed interior changes include removal of the original stair, reconfiguration of the floor plan, and upgrading of finishes to contemporary standards. Parking is provided in an existing detached garage at the south of the street, accessed off Cedar Crescent. The proposal generally conforms with First Shaughnessy requirements and guidelines.

Items for discussion include architectural integration of the additional floor area, impact on the building massing and roof form, architectural resolution of the proposed changes to the front porch, and degree of retention of original interior features.

Questions

Please comment on the success of the architectural and landscape design in relation to First Shaughnessy guidelines, including:

- a) General commentary on impact on the original building, including:

- i. architectural compatibility of proposed and existing construction, with specific comments on impacts to the existing roof form, entry porch, railings and interior;
- ii. materiality and colour

b) Landscape design

- i. entry sequence to the porch and tree removal;
- ii. visual prominence of garage
- iii. site grading

**Applicant's
Introductory
Comments**

The Architect, Piers Cunnington, gave a general overview followed by presentation on the architectural and landscape strategy. Changes to increase functionality are proposed while retaining heritage character. The geometry of the existing porch will be retained, with the front door brought forward several feet to improve the circulation within the house. A second floor addition is proposed, along with a new extension mimicking the profile of the existing roof. The massing is otherwise maintained, and the existing chimney will be refurbished.

The Design team worked within the historical, site and landscape context. Heritage consultant, Don Luxton, described the history, noting the Four Square style, noting the approach has been to respect the architecture and heritage through a high degree of retention with interventions to the rear of the house, and preserving the front entry. Several windows will be relocated to reflect an updated room layout.

**Panel's
Consensus on
Key Aspects
Needing
Improvement**

The Panel commended the project, noting the presentation was excellent, the plans were very clear, and the overall approach is supported.

The Panel commented as follows:

- The Panel appreciates retention of the original porch geometry.
- The addition fits in well with the house.
- It is desirable to keep as much of the interior elements as possible due to the high degree of preservation.
- Consider retaining the non By-Law size shrubs given many are located in planting beds.
- Resolve discrepancies between the model and landscape plan (i.e. balance amount of tree planting on east and west sides).
- Limit tree removal due to construction as much as possible.
- Tree retention and removal plans would benefit from more clarity.
- Relocation of the Japanese Maple is supported.
- Consider reducing some streetscape planting along the street side of the hedge for a simpler look.
- Tree protection and water runoff in the garage area needs to be looked at to address potential ponding.

**Planning
Department
Closing
Comments**

The project is well resolved. Several items discussed with the architect include consideration to retain the original roof and incorporate a lower subordinate roof over the second floor addition, and maintaining the original geometry of the upper part of the porch which is visually prominent from the street. Lastly, as this is a rare example of a building with a high degree of interior preservation including coffered ceilings, extensive woodwork and stairs, it is desirable to preserve or re-use these elements in some way.

Item 2

EVALUATION

SUPPORT (UNANIMOUS)

Description
Review
Applicant
Delegation

New Building-non protected property Proposal
Second
Stefan Wiedemann, Architect

Introduction

1399 Matthews

Planning Comments:

This project proposes a new two and a half-storey single family dwelling with a detached garage accessed from Matthews Avenue. The existing 1978 dwelling will be demolished.

The project was reviewed at the February 17, 2022, First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel meeting. The Panel requested resubmission to review tree retention and siting of the garage, usability of the rear yard, and visual exposure of the east façade to the adjacent property.

This applicant prepared a revised site plan and submission materials for review.

Questions to Panel:

1. Does the revised proposal sufficiently address previous panel commentary?
2. Please comment on the success of the architectural and landscape design in relation to First Shaughnessy guidelines, including design resolution of the rear yard, tree retention, and interface with adjacent properties.

**Applicant's
Introductory
Comments**

- Architect Stefan Wiedemann gave a general overview of the changes since the review last month. The architectural design was amended to adjust the upper right and left windows on the body of the building to match the rest of the building. The garage was reduced by one bay, now incorporates a stacker, and was redesigned to resemble a cottage. It was shifted west to create more garden on the east, softening views from the street, and creating more usable space for the family. The total amount of hard landscaping has been reduced, and lawn was increased from 11 to 17 feet in width. The landscaping was opened up along with the path to allow for multipurpose use. The garage is further

outside of the tree protection zone, and typical excavation measures to protect existing trees will be implemented. Heavy duty triple-laminated asphalt shingle roofing is proposed.

**Panel's
Consensus on
Key Aspects
Needing
Improvement**

The Panel thanked the design team for the quick turnaround of the changes, all of which are an improvement to the proposal.

The Panel commented as follows:

- Reducing the size of the garage helps open up the site and creates a much more usable rear yard.
- Deletion of the auto court gives a more pedestrian-friendly character.
- Changing the front windows to match the proportions of the others is positive for the streetscape.
- Consider use of cedar shingle roofing, which is preferred to asphalt shingles.

**Planning
Department
Closing
Comments**

The Planning Department thanked the design team for their work to resolve the previous issues, and for the significant improvements to the scheme.