

FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: June 18, 2015

TIME: 4:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, Vancouver City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE FIRST SHAUGHNESSY DESIGN PANEL:

Linda Collins	Chair, Resident
Peter Kappel	Resident, SHPOA
Mollie Massie	Vancouver Heritage
Kerri-Lee Watson	Resident, REBGV
Kathy Reichert	Resident
Lori Hodgkinson	Resident
Frank Shorrock	SHPOA
David Nelson	SHPOA
Hakano Amaya	BCSLA
Donna Chomichuk	BCSLA
D'Arcy Jones	AIBC

CITY STAFF:

Colin King	Development Planner
Tim Potter	Development Planner

LIAISONS:

Melissa de Genova	City Councillor
George Affleck	City Councillor

REGRETS:	Dallas Brodie	Vice-Chair, Resident, SHPOA
	Joanne Giesbrecht	REBGV
	Jim Huffman	AIBC

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lidia Mcleod

1.	1341 Mathews Av
2.	1460 Mathews Av

Business Meeting

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

Business:

- HAPL Update:
 - An update on the zoning review of First Shaughnessy District provided by staff and consultants.

MOVED by Ms. Collins
SECONDED by Ms. Watson

TO withhold projects that have not been viewed by panel yet, or projects that have been previously rejected by panel.

SUPPORT (7 in favor, 3 abstentions, 0 against)

Project Updates:

- None

Review of Minutes:

- None

The Panel considered two applications for presentation

Address:	1341 Matthews
Description:	New House Post-Date Site
Review:	Application (First)
Architect:	Loy Leyland
Delegation:	Loy Leyland, Julie Hicks

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (0 in favor, 1 abstention, 9 against)

Planning Comments:

This is a proposal for a new house on a mid-block, post-date site on Matthews Avenue with no lane access. The lot does not have any significant cross slopes and includes mature trees, concentrated around the rear shared property line to the north, and to the front of the lot at the shared property line to the eastern neighbour. Tree removal is relatively limited and supported by an arborist report. The house is in accordance with provisions of the current ODP as it relates to siting, setbacks, double-height spaces, etc. Parking is at grade to the east side yard and excluded by virtue of being beneath residential living space; the basement area is partially developed. The house is presented as 'Tudor-Craftsman' and features a primary cross gable with asymmetrical vertically, expressed bays to the front elevation, and tripartite massing through variation of material expression at each level.

Questions to Panel:

Staff are seeking commentary from the panel as follows:

1. General commentary around the proposed architectural and landscape design proposals as they relate to the FS ODP & Guidelines.

Specific commentary around the location of the proposed pool in the west side yard as it relates to neighbourliness in light of proposed tree removal and landscape design.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The house is on a post-date site and the clients wanted a traditional look with a turret element. There is a nice side port-cochere and the height has been accentuated the best we can. A pool exists which could be a problem in its current location. The parking is at grade and gives a 'court' effect. Traditional form and materials are being used.

Landscape:

Across the front of the project there is a very un-friendly street edge with an uncapped existing low stone wall, featuring a high fence on top of it. The proposal is to retain the wall, to put a cap on it, and then to put a wrought iron fence on top of it. The current vehicular opening is also to be retained with new gates and gate posts. The pedestrian entry is new and designed to be opposite the front door.

A number of existing trees, including a Dogwood and a Maple, exist around the site. The tree retention plan keeps the existing paving in place to protect the tree roots. When inside the property there are a lot of very nice views, including the existing side yard shrubs which are to be retained.

The trees along the side yard line by the pool were determined to be of poor quality by an arborist before a pool was being considered for the area. So they would have been taken out regardless. The north property line on this site and the adjacent one are slightly raised up from grade. This grade is being retained with a garden added at a lower grade. There is not much grass and lawn; however, a sunken patio and small fountain exists along with a lot of planting in the back. Additional planting will help screen the neighbours and provide filigree across the front.

Panel Commentary:

Although the panel is glad that the old house is being replaced the proposed house seems to be too big for the lot size, and displays an over-utilized style which is contrary to the First Shaughnessy ODP. The design also utilizes too many styles and materials, which make it seem confusing and busy from the streetscape.

The roofs should all share a similar slope and use something other than durroid shingles. All of the facias could be combined to create a common fascia, and as there are double-height ceilings inside the windows need to better reflect the space by being more vertical. As well, having the chimney use the same material as the base takes away from the tripartite expression.

While the panel appreciates that there is no below-ground parking, there needs to be much more of a buffer between the driveway and the pool. As the house is too big and pushes the pool up against the property line, more greenery will add additional privacy and screening for the neighbours.

Overall there is too much hard surface and not enough green space on the property. The back of the garden seems too busy without serving enough function, there is not enough of an 'estate-like' quality, and more decorative elements are needed. Adding a First Shaughnessy gate and additional planting could help address this.

Chair Summary:

The lack of variation of architectural design and repetitive design in the neighbourhood is contrary to First Shaughnessy ODP which calls for varying styles. There are too many materials being used and they are not of good quality, the design is too busy, and there needs to be a more robust and better roof. The front gate could also be more special, and the pool needs more of a buffer between it and the neighbour. The back yard is too busy and the house has maxed out property. This house needs more work to gain support from the panel.

Address:	1460 Matthews
Description:	Stuart Howard
Review:	New House Post-Date Site
Architect:	Application (First)
Delegation:	

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (3 in favor, 1 abstention, 6 against)

Planning Comments:

This is a proposal for a new house on a flat, mid-block, post-date site on Matthews Avenue with no lane access. Mature trees are predominately located along the shared west side yard and some tree removal is proposed. The house is in accordance with provisions of the current ODP as it relates to siting, setbacks, etc. Parking is located in the basement to the rear of the dwelling, accessed by means of an excavated ramp along the east side yard. The 2-storey dwelling employs zinc as a roofing material throughout, and limestone cladding differentiated by panel size and banding in the same material on all elevations. Landscape proposals include significant extents of hard surface in the rear yard, and a low stone wall with new hedge behind to the street frontage.

Questions to Panel:

Staff are seeking advice from the panel as follows:

1. Commentary around the proposed architectural and landscape design proposals as they relate to the FS ODP & Guidelines, with specific reference to the following items:
 - i. Roof form & material expression;
 - ii. Tripartite expression and external material finish;
 - iii. Landscape principles to the street frontage as it relates to enclosure, screening and layering.
2. General commentary on landscape proposals as they relate to the FS Guideline objectives around a dwelling in pastoral landscape setting, acknowledging the relatively narrow frontage (95ft) but noting the extents of hard surface proposed for the rear and east yards.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

This is a post-date house built in the 60s or early 70's, and has a mansard roof appearance to it with a red used-brick base. The existing siting is similar to the proposed siting; thus the driveway on the side exists in its current location. The slope of the driveway is almost the same as well, but may be made a bit deeper. The cut, retaining wall and hedge are all existing and to be retained.

The house is a contemporary interpretation of a prairie-style Georgian, and a tripartite expression is being attempted with the use of similar materials but different textures. The base of the building is limestone in a split face. Moving up the building this becomes smoother and utilizes different colours and degrees of sheen with the limestone to create the banding. The zinc roof tops off the house with a heavy-detailed soffit to bring the roof plane to the forefront.

With large overhangs, the last 18 inches use a gutter appearance to give the form a more horizontal look at the soffit level. Very elegantly proportioned windows are used to achieve verticality. Overall the house is quite symmetrical and has a lot of tall windows, doors and balconies to accent the vertical nature of the scheme.

Landscape:

Looking from the street at the front this appears to be a funny, old house with a low wall and a Birch tree and red Japanese Maple which are being proposed for removal. Across the street face is a more traditional First Shaughnessy landscape, with more hedges and a stronger sense of enclosure. The hope is to provide some separation with a wall and a hedge, but to incorporate some nice views and layering at the pedestrian level. The hedge will be pulled back, which will allow for the plating of a tree and some perennial planting on the street-side.

A formal entry is being created to accentuate the formal style of the house, and there is much usable space on the front lawn. Stepped walls with planting will be beside the driveway down the side. Two trees are being removed and replaced by six others.

At the back the symmetrical feel of the house has been extended in a contemporary way with a wall and a bench. The hot tub is located as far away from the neighbours as is reasonable while still maintaining sitting and dining spaces.

Panel Commentary:

Although the house is quite elegant in design and uses quality materials, it is too urban for First Shaughnessy and doesn't appear to fit in well. First Shaughnessy houses typically have an estate or country feel, as well as a front door which makes an impression. This house does not embody those things and feels cold in comparison to other structures in the area.

Part of the problem is the lack of tripartite expression. Even though there's a triple band expression the horizontal needs to be strengthened further to make a true tripartite look. Changing materials from limestone to rusticated stone could help with this. Making a rural driveway or adding buffer between the driveway and the house could help offset all the rock and soften the overall look.

The roof of the house could be quieter, and the soft fascia should be dropped down to offset the monolithic look of the structure. Currently the roof doesn't fit in with the streetscape and needs to be less flat.

The panel was concerned about the amount of impermeable area, and felt that in general a more pastoral landscape was needed. Some additional greenery could be mixed into the back patio to help help with this, and the landscape needs more planting overall.

Chair Summary:

It is refreshing to see something different presented within Shaughnessy. Though the house is elegant in design, with so much stone-work the house appears cold and could use more landscaping to soften it up. It could also use more of a tripartite expression and the roof could be more dominant. The panel understands that site is a challenge, but so much hardscape in the backyard it is not what is looked for in First Shaughnessy, and more planting in back would soften the project. The proportions of the house are good and there are nice windows. Surface and roof treatment, and more planting, could soften the house and help it blend into the streetscape more. The front door should be more significant and more of an 'event'.

This house does not fit into First Shaughnessy but has good architecture, and stand-alone-projects can sometimes be good. With more planting in back and work on the roof it might be a more suitable project for this neighbourhood.

Adjournment:

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