

FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: January 30, 2014

TIME: 4:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room 116, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE FIRST SHAUGHNESSY DESIGN PANEL:

Hakano Amaya	BCSLA
Donna Chomichuk	BCSLA
Linda Collins	Chair, Resident
Erika Gardner	Resident
Peter Kappel	Resident, SHPOA
Benjamin Ling	AIBC
Mollie Massie	Vancouver Heritage
Lisa MacIntosh	REBGV
Alastair Munro	Resident, SHPOA
David Nelson	Resident
Frank Shorrock	Resident, SHPOA
Kerri-Lee Watson	Resident

CITY STAFF:

Colin King	Development Planner
Tim Potter	Development Planner

LIAISONS:

George Affleck	City Councillor
----------------	-----------------

REGRETS: Dallas Brodie Vice-Chair, Resident, SHPOA
Lori Hodgkinson Resident

RECORDING

SECRETARY: Dorothy Kerr

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	2071 West King Edward Avenue - Application (2nd)
2.	3989 Angus Drive - Application
3.	1626 Laurier Avenue - Enquiry

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Collins called the meeting to order at 4:05 pm and noted the presence of a quorum.

Business:

There was discussion about possible ways to improve the FS ODP. The following topics were mentioned as a starting framework for further discussion and development:

1. SFR Square Foot Ratio

Parking, mechanical rooms and double height ceilings are proposed to count towards the SFR.

2. Side Yard Setbacks

For larger properties the side yard setbacks could be proportional to the size of the lot, rather than a set measurement. For example, proportional side yard setbacks would give a more positive result in the heritage restoration project at 1550 Marpole Avenue.

3. Developer Incentives

For respecting the integrity of the heritage neighbourhood developer incentives could be used. One example of this could be if the front and side yard setbacks are maintained, an incentive could be offered to the owner such as increased square footage or an increase in height.

4. No rezoning in First Shaughnessy

The building of apartment buildings or townhouses in First Shaughnessy would completely destroy the intended preservation of this heritage area. The area needs to be protected.

Benjamin Ling AIBC gave a presentation about how supplying more detailed construction drawings could benefit the finished building project. At issue is how the finished house can look very different from the approved plans. One solution may be for the City to require more detailed construction drawings from the architects in order to help ensure the designs and plans the City approves are built to specification.

Mr. Ling explained that architects offer different levels of service, one of which is called a Contract to Approval in which architects are contracted to supply the minimum amount of design drawings required for submission to the City to obtain approval. If the owner does not want to pay the extra fees for the continued services of an architect through construction problems can arise as the builders do not have the services of an architect to depend upon during construction.

Project Updates:

Staff updated the panel with regard to enquiries and applications at the following addresses:

3837 Hudson Street	Minor Amendment to lower chimney received
3750 Cartier Avenue	Merit Evaluation required SOS requested
1926 Cedar Crescent	Merit Evaluation required: SOS received
1426 Laurier Avenue	Merit Evaluation required: SOS received
1837 West 19th Avenue	Merit Evaluation required: SOS received
3837 Osler Street	Proceeding with new house enquiry post-date site
3738 Pine Crescent	Proceeding with new house enquiry post-date site

1664 Cedar Crescent	Application received: FSADP February 20th (tentative)
1126 Wolfe Avenue	Application received: FSADP February 20th (tentative)
3743 Cypress Street	Application received: FSADP February 20th (tentative)
1037 West King Edward	Preliminary design development advice issued January 16th

Review of Minutes:

The minutes from October 17th, 2013 were voted on and approved.

The Panel considered two applications and one enquiry for presentation.

- | | | |
|----|--------------|--|
| 1. | Address: | 2071 West King Edward Avenue |
| | Description: | Construction of a new house on a post-date site |
| | Review: | Application - Second (previous review November 26, 2013) |
| | Architect: | Farpoint Architecture |
| | Delegation: | John Keen Architect, Donna Chomichuk Landscape Architect |

EVALUATION: SUPPORT: (10 in favor, 1 abstention)

Planning Comments:

This is a proposal to construct a new house on a post-date site. The site has an approximate 18' - 0' slope from front to back. The site is located near East Boulevard. A relaxation with respect to height and garage location is contemplated in this proposal. The proposal was reviewed by the FSADP on November 28th, 2013 at which time the enquiry was supported with the desire that the application be brought to the Panel with concerns addressed. Concerns were around light access to the north facing terrace at ground level, and that a sufficient quality of materials and landscape were carried through to application and construction.

Questions to Panel:

1. Does the application successfully address previous feedback of the Panel?
2. Does the Panel have any additional comments related to the FS ODP and Guidelines?
3. How well has the landscape design been resolved?

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Panel support was unanimous at the enquiry and the project has been further developed. In discussions with Planning it was suggested that since the site is so narrow (75' at the front and 50' at the back) there could be an allowance for the garage to move a small amount into the side yard.

A materials and color board is supplied. In terms of materials there is a blue stone accent band in the paving patterns; on the building there is stucco in a grey/taupe color. The windows and soffits would be done in a stain rather than paint because one of the most dramatic elements of this house is that it sits on a promontory and the viewer would see the wood soffits of the roof as opposed to the actual roof.

Landscape:

There are about 25 specimen sized trees on the property. A draft arborist report states most of the trees and large shrubs are not in good shape and City staff have concurred with this assessment. It might be possible to retain one or two trees in the north east corner. We have had discussions with the City about permission to clear out the bamboo on the boulevard as we are thinking about replacing the bamboo with lawn. There are twenty-five trees to be removed from the site and we are proposing twenty-eight new trees some of which will be large enough in size to create a look of instant maturity.

Panel Commentary:

Panel members generally agreed that the landscape proposals had been well developed since the enquiry and were matching well with the contemporary look of the house. The relaxations sought were generally supported due to site topography, although some members recommended a more moderate height interpretation.

There was discussion about height and the fact this proposal seems to tower over the surrounding houses. It is expected these houses will redevelop over time at which point the height of this house would not be a major issue. The majority of members supported the height relaxation due to the unusual site topography.

There was commentary that although this is a very modern house, it incorporates the spirit of the FS ODP and would be a positive addition to the District. It was again noted that the design of this house gives a nod to Frank Lloyd Wright.

Panel members appreciated the fully developed materials board with color. The materials board supports the idea that what the Panel approves will actually be built. The Panel noted that in this case the owner has retained the services of the architect through the construction phase which further ensures a quality project built to approved specifications.

Chair Summary:

This project was well received last time and positively received this time. It was noted the landscape design matches the style of a contemporary house. This project mirrors the spirit of the FS ODP and has a Frank Lloyd Wright flare. Members generally favor the height interpretation and the new siting of the garage. It is important with a house like this that detailed drawings be supplied to the builder, and it is noted the architect will stay with this project through to completion. The house supports the character of First Shaughnessy and the project follows the Guidelines.

A motion to support the application was taken and seconded. Support was noted with ten in favor and one abstention.

2.	Address:	3989 Angus Drive
	Description:	Retention and additions to existing pre-date site
	Review:	Application - First
	Architect:	Loy Leyland Architect
	Delegation:	Loy Leyland

EVALUATION: SUPPORT: (11 in favor, 1 abstention)

Planning Comments:

This is a proposal for the retention of an existing pre-date 1918 house. The house will have a new foundation constructed. The existing parking garage and carport is proposed to be retained in place as is. A new south facing light well is proposed in addition to a new stairwell located in the west side yard.

Questions to Panel:

1. Please provide comments on the overall success of the proposal.
2. Please comment on the landscape design and its overall success.

Staff Introductory Comments:

Tim Potter introduced the project noting the house was originally built in 1918 and that it has fine attributes and detailing. Part of the scope of this project is a new foundation, the house will be raised and the foundation repaired to make the basement more habitable. This is the type of project we are looking for in terms of preserving heritage, we want to expedite projects like this that maintain heritage and keep the existing footprint.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

This is a pre-date house, the plan is to refurbish the exterior of this heritage house while keeping the footprint mostly intact. We plan to leave the front yard and side yard setbacks as they are. The owners wish to concentrate on the house at this time and wish to leave the landscape and garage plans to a future date.

We are proposing a new entryway as currently the entrance to the house is weak. We propose to add no additional floor space at this time. For now we are hoping the Panel will agree with the decision to leave what currently exists in place in terms of landscaping and parking and concentrate on the house.

Landscape:

No landscape proposals were presented.

Panel commentary:

There was some concern that the panel had not been presented with enough information to know where the project may go in the future, and that more detailed information and drawings should be required. It was noted that no major changes to the exterior are proposed.

There was concern that the interior of the house had been gutted prior to permits issued. Because of this members were concerned about what might happen to the quality of the exterior of the house. The Panel wants assurances that the promised quality of design and finishes on the exterior of the house will be delivered.

There was an understanding of the applicant's wish to expedite the development process.

The Panel wants to encourage the retention of heritage houses particularly when the front and side yard setbacks are maintained, because of this the Panel is supportive of the applicants wishes for this application to go forward quickly.

There was concern about cutting down trees between this house and the neighbor to the west, and a desire to know if the trees will be replaced with new trees.

It was generally agreed that the existing carport is in need of assistance, and that a landscape plan would be welcome.

The Panel sees this project as something of a poster child for saving and refurbishing an old house. The Panel supports this effort to revitalize the home, but also notes that the client should follow proper City permit processes in the future.

Chair Summary:

There is a lot of support for this project as it retains and renovates an existing heritage house. It was noted the architect proposes maintaining the front and side yard setbacks, because of this and because this is a heritage retention project the Panel does not want to see the issues of landscaping and the carport stand in the way of expediting approvals for this project.

The Panel requests to see a materials and color board for the house, and to know the builders will be provided with detailed construction drawings. The Panel needs assurances that the promised quality will be maintained.

After some amendment a recommendation to support the project moving forward with consideration of existing landscape and carport issues was passed. The motion included a request for assurances of the delivery of quality materials and detail. The motion was passed with 11 members in favor and one abstaining.

3.	Address:	1626 Laurier Avenue
	Description:	Retention and additions to existing pre-date heritage B house
	Review:	Enquiry - First
	Architect:	Formwerks Architectural
	Delegation:	Jim Bussey Architect, Claudia Koerner Landscape Architect

EVALUATION: SUPPORT: (9 in favor, 0 against)

Planning Comments:

This is a proposal for the retention of and additions to an existing pre-date 1913 Heritage B house. Vehicular access from the street will be removed and lane access only provided. The existing house has been significantly altered on the interior and a significant exterior addition previously occurred to the east. Additions are primarily proposed to the rear and west. The original house design was symmetrical, with the previous addition creating an asymmetrical elevation. The rationale behind the siting and expression of the new addition is to restore the symmetry of the original design. The level of retention and expression has been discussed with Heritage staff and broadly supported.

Questions to Panel:

1. Please provide comments on the overall success of the proposal, particularly with regards to the expression of the new addition to the front.

Staff Introductory Comments:

The project was presented by Colin King who explained that the vehicular access has been moved to the rear of the property. He also described the siting of the new side additions to the main house.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The original house was built in the 1920s, and was extremely symmetrical. The addition plus the original house have undergone a previous high quality renovation. This house in its original form as outlined on the Statement of Significance shows what portion of the house is original. The interiors are done extremely well but the house doesn't fit with the new owners.

The dominant feature in this retention scheme is to reinstate the original symmetry of the house. The style of this house is similar to what can be seen in some parts of the southern United States. The addition, even though it was well done for the time falls a bit short of current attitudes: there are no windows on the upper level and the roof is flat. The current proposal is to reshape the additions to keep them elegantly back from the main symmetry of the house, and the roof style of the additions will help the house fit into the Shaughnessy setting

Landscape:

Taking out the double vehicular crossing in the front restores the front yard to a very pastoral, leafy situation with some filigree and base planting. There will be a U-shaped driveway with an entrance from the lane. There will be 4 underground parking spaces. The very large trees in the back yard will be preserved. The hedge work around the perimeter of the property is well established and helps to maintain privacy. We will be augmenting the existing hedge work. The dominant feature in the backyard will be the circular driveway with a pool, creating an elegant circular shape at the rear of the house.

Panel Commentary:

The siting of the house on this large property was well received. Overall this was seen as an exemplary proposal that retains the original home but allows it to move into the present century.

Moving the driveway from the front yard to the back yard was generally well received but there were concerns that the back yard was a very car dominant design. There appears to be a weak connection from inside the house to the back yard, it would be good to see another connection with the back yard rather than only through the garage.

It was noted that this is already a very attractive home that won the National Home Builders top honor award for all of North America. When the house was redone in the 1980's the owners added the swimming pool, cabana and glass second story with an observatory.

There was discussion that the north elevation, or the front of the house, benefits greatly from the added wing to the west through the use of the strong symmetry; and that the existing west elevation is currently far too bulky and is much improved in the new design.

There was some concern expressed with the modern design of the south elevation, and how this does not fit with the design of the rest of the house. The competing view was that the strong use of symmetry on the south elevation presents a grand façade.

It was noted that the roof lines seem to be competing for attention with each other and perhaps could be cleaned up. There was mention that the windows in the back portion of the east elevation seem to be a bit scattered and that this area feels like it needs to be further developed.

Chair Summary:

This is a well supported project. The panel likes the retention of the heritage aspects of the house. There were comments about the back yard being car dominant. We would like to see something rather than solid paving for the driveway, perhaps some type of pavers to make it a

greener driveway. The panel is pleased that the front yard will be a pedestrian yard and that the driveway is moved to the rear. The new addition is well received.

The overall consensus on the rear or the south elevation is that most people support the grande façade design of this elevation. There was a comment that perhaps there could be more flow from the house for people to get into the back yard.

This is an enquiry and there has been a lot of work done on this project for an enquiry. This is the kind of project we want to see in First Shaughnessy, this project follows the ODP and Guidelines. A motion to support with the panel reviewing again as an application with concerns addressed was moved, seconded and supported unanimously.

Adjournment:

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 pm.