

FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: April 16, 2015

TIME: 4:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, Vancouver City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE FIRST SHAUGHNESSY DESIGN PANEL:

Hanako Amaya	BCSLA
Dallas Brodie	Vice-Chair, Resident, SHPOA
Donna Chomichuk	BCSLA
Linda Collins	Chair, Resident
Joanne Giesbrecht	REBGV
Lori Hodgkinson	Resident
Jim Huffman	AIBC
D’Arcy Jones	AIBC
Peter Kappel	Resident, SHPOA
Mollie Massie	Vancouver Heritage
Kathy Reichert	Resident
Frank Shorrock	Resident, SHPOA
Kerri-Lee Watson	Resident

CITY STAFF:

Georgina Lyons	Development Planner
Colin King	Development Planner
Tim Potter	Development Planner
Marco D’Agostini	Heritage Planner
Tami Gill	Heritage Planner
Tanis Knowles Yarnell	Heritage Planner

LIAISONS: Melissa de Genova City Councillor

REGRETS: George Affleck City Councillor
David Nelson Resident

RECORDING
SECRETARY: Lidia Mcleod

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	1390 Laurier Avenue (Application - second)
2.	3688 Hudson Street (Application - first)

BUSINESS MEETING

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

Business:

Welcome new members, and welcome to Development Planner Georgina Lyons who is taking over from Colin King as City liaison for the FS Panel.

Panel elections were held for 2015, Linda Collins was re-elected Chair and Kathy Reichert was elected Vice-Chair.

Heritage Action Plan:

There was an HAPL Update, the existing FS Heritage Register list is being updated, and the establishment of a Heritage Conservation area was presented to be called the FS Heritage Conservation Area. City Staff presented an update on Open Houses for the Heritage Action Plan.

Review of minutes:

The minutes from February 12, 2015 were adopted.

The Panel considered two Applications for presentation

- | | | |
|----|--------------|---|
| 1. | Address: | 1390 Laurier Avenue |
| | Description: | New house on a post-date site |
| | Review: | Application - second |
| | Architect: | Loy Leyland Architect |
| | Delegation: | Loy Leyland Architect, Ron Rule Landscape Architect |
-

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (3 in favor, 2 abstentions, 7 against)

Planning Comments:

This is a proposal for a new dwelling on a 99ft x 100ft lot with no lane service at the south east corner of Laurier Avenue & Cartier Street. Parking is located in the basement and accessed via a new sidewalk crossing to Laurier Ave. From the east side yard. An existing crossing is located on Cartier St. A preliminary enquiry was presented to the Panel on May 15, 2015. The substance of this was to garner support for the relocation of the access, which the panel did support on the grounds that relocation afforded improved livability to south facing family spaces. The application is described as reflecting the Arts & Crafts and Tudor styles and demonstrates a formal symmetry with materials including rough stucco with half timbering details to the body of the house and a granite base. Double height space is limited to the entrance hall. Cartier St.

An Arborist report has been submitted, and landscape staff note that existing landscaping at property edges is in good condition, but is proposed to be removed and replaced with new foundation walls with greenery behind.

Questions to Panel:

Staff are seeking commentary from the panel as follows:

1. General commentary on the proposed form of development and architectural expression of the dwelling as it relates to the FS ODP & Guidelines;
2. Specific commentary around the sunken patio and access arrangements to the rec room in the rear yard;
3. Specific landscape commentary as it relates to the landscape treatment to the street edge, noting that the FSD Guidelines encourage the retention of mature existing greenery.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

This is a very small site on the corner; the existing crossing is from Cartier. The house is modest with not very much yard, but it sits nicely on the corner of a post-date site. The style is half Timberline with a Tudor slant.

Landscape:

The existing street trees are very mature. There is a lot of shade on the west section of the property. A nice hedge exists, but putting in granite walls and new hedging would be more in keeping with the guidelines. Two existing trees are being proposed for removal, with twenty new trees to be planted as replacement. Fountains exist at the entry and near the back, leading into a very narrow back garden. The front is very symmetrical, with a shade garden on the side and yard area for children. Overall there is a very modest expression.

Panel Commentary:

The panel feels that the current house is too wide and does not appear to exhibit its Tudor elements well. Although the current plans are elegant in their simplicity, more embellishment and delicacy are needed in order to match the character and charm of the surrounding houses.

The wideness of the building is further exacerbated by two competing chimneys, one of which appears to hang in mid-air. As they currently take away from the tripartite expression one of them could be taken out, and the other replaced with more traditional material such as brick.

It was discussed that the front entrance is not prominent enough and needs a stronger roof form above. Too much glazing exists near the door and competes with the other windows around the house. In general the windows appear to have too much trim and are not in the same Tudor style as the house. Additionally, the stonework under the windows at the front also seems too skinny and out-of place.

The stucco and wood appear ill-used and are not in keeping with the architecture of the house. The stucco could appear more prominent as it currently seems like a wood trim house with stucco patches. The timber competes with the exposed rafter tails, more wrought iron and timber would give the house more strength.

There were comments from the Panel that the roof would be improved if it used a material other than asphalt. Specifically, a cedar shake roof would be preferred.

Overall the garden design is too busy and needs to be simplified. In the back the sunken patio seems hodgepodge and unnecessary. Maintenance will be a problem as the patio will be a big hole for refuse. The back terrace planters are not in keeping with the design of the rest of the house.

The driveway appears too contemporary and could be changed to better reflect the Tudor style and to create more permeable area.

There was discussion that the hedge is lovely and should be retained if possible. If the hedge must be removed the Panel would like to see a shorter hedge, and one with varying distances from the line of the street, meaning one not in a straight line. This would give more interest and to allow more views into the property from the street.

Chair Summary:

The front entrance, columns and wood trim on the house could be more substantial. The thin wooden timbers take away from the robustness of design expected in First Shaughnessy.

The front elevation appears too rigid and needs to creatively loosen up to fit with the streetscape. More work on the front façade specifically a beefed-up front entrance would help the house fit into the surrounding neighbourhood.

While chimneys are an important aspect of First Shaughnessy, the proposed chimneys would look better in brick. There is an issue with the chimney over the garage appearing to be floating; this chimney should either be altered or removed.

Finally, the garden design is too busy and needs to be simplified. The sunken patio at the back needs more design work as it looks impractical to keep clean and appears to be a dark hole in the backyard. The saw-cut driveway doesn't fit in with the style of the house. There were comments about retaining the hedge and perhaps altering it to add filigree or a look-through quality.

1.	Address:	3688 Hudson Street
	Description:	New house on a post-date site
	Review:	Application - first
	Architect:	Loy Leyland Architect
	Delegation:	Loy Leyland Architect, Donna Chomichuk Landscape Architect

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (1 in favor, 7 against)

Planning Comments:

This is a proposal for a new dwelling on a 227ft x 136ft mid-block lot with no lane service. Parking is located at grade in the north side yard, accessed an existing crossing to Hudson St. A second crossing is proposed, and supported given the frontage width of this large site. The dwelling demonstrates tripartite expression within a symmetrical formal massing with a street facing gable flanked by vertical bays topped with turreted roof forms. The application features significant double height spaces in the central mass of the front elevation, the window treatment of which is differentiated from single story volumes at the second floor level. Staff note that side yards provided are above the minimum requirement under zoning.

An Arborist report has been submitted and reviewed by landscape staff, who note that the existing trees proposed for removal in the side yards are in poor condition due to previous topping and removal seems supportable. Maple trees in the rear yard are a high priority for retention.

Questions to Panel:

Staff are seeking commentary from the panel as follows:

1. General commentary on the proposed form of development and architectural expression of the dwelling as it relates to the FS ODP & Guidelines;
2. Specific commentary around the relationship between the covered porches and open terraces at grade level and sunken patio at lower level with the rear yard;
3. Specific landscape commentary as it relates to the relocation of the existing maple trees in the rear yard and removal of trees in the front yard to facilitate the landscape plan.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The house is quite large and was made with symmetry in mind. The roof is simple with large cross gables. The materials are a very high standard, although the roof could be done in slate instead of Duroid. The detailing is definitely estate-like and tripartite as consistent with First Shaughnessy. Parking is at grade and works quite well.

Landscape:

The current site is an early 60's landscape, and has a lot of erosion around the trees and root zones. A lot of the trees are overgrown spruces, firs and cypresses which are being proposed for removal. The big maple trees in the back will be moved to open up the back space and provide more breathing room. Two large spruces in the front are being removed in order to install a more pastoral landscape. They will be replaced with a tree of significant scale and other, softer, elements. A formal patio comes out into a summer garden with roses and lavender, as well as a pavilion. Outside walls have been terraced with planting to make them less wall-like when seen from the basement.

Panel Commentary:

The panel thinks that this is a very pretty house in the wrong neighbourhood. Although the centre of the house is successful, it is not in keeping with the style of the flanking sides. The house also doesn't appear to have a conversation with the other houses in the neighbourhood and actually detracts from the streetscape. It also appears not to adhere to any one school of design and seems too busy. More of a setback would help differentiate it from the large neighboring house.

The proposed design is simply too massive and will overwhelm the site. Dual turrets and gables at each end contribute to the massing and create an overbearing structure. The gables also break the roof up into pieces and compete with the other rooflines; although they do detract from the squatness of the house. Overall the panel felt that more verticality was needed to bring the house up instead of out.

The symmetry of the house is not supported. A Duroid roof seems inappropriate and the skylights may not supportable.

Overall there are too many materials, and no one material seems to be prominent. There are a confusing number of angular railings, the port cochère should be located at the front, and the porches are too commercial in style and should be softened. The windows at the front appear stark, and the windows on the west elevation have too many different types of trim.

While the panel is pleased with the amount of outdoor space being proposed, they feel the house has two front yards and no back. The front achieves an estate feel, but the back should maintain a sense of informality in order to contrast the imposing aspect of the house. Working around the

trees or moving them somewhere that isn't the edge of the property line could help with this. It is acceptable to take out a few trees in order to achieve this look.

The sunken patio at the back works well with the landscaping in the backyard. However, the stonework in the front comes up quite high and looks out of place. Keeping the stonework lower at a lower level than the eaves would be preferable.

Chair Summary:

This was a clear presentation with good artwork and a good model. However the house is not in character with the other homes in the area and it overwhelms the site. Specifically, the two large dome roof elements or turrets on either side of the house are too dominant.

There are too many materials on the house, and the copper on two large turret elements clashes with the asphalt shingles. Slate tile would be a better choice for roof material. The stonework on the bay windows would look better if it were situated at a lower level than the rooflines. The skylight doesn't appear to be an issue. On a positive note the sunken patio works in this case as it flows into the back yard. The Panel understands that in this particular case some of the trees need to be removed.

Overall this house is over-powering and may be improved with one dome element rather than two as this would provide some asymmetry. This house is not compatible with the surrounding houses or streetscape. A farther setback and more garden-like feel would help with this and be better for the surrounding neighbourhood.

Adjournment:

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 6:20pm