

FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: May 15, 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
Lori Hodgkinson	Resident
Erika Gardner	Resident
Robert Johnson	AIBC
Peter Kappel	Resident, SHPOA
Benjamin Ling	AIBC
Lisa MacIntosh	REBGV
Mollie Massie	Vancouver Heritage
Alastair Munro	Resident, SHPOA
Frank Shorrock	Resident, SHPOA
David Nelson	Resident
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

RECORDING

SECRETARY: Dorothy Kerr

1.	1664 Cedar Crescent (Application - fourth)
2.	1238 Balfour Avenue (Application - first)
3.	1390 Laurier Avenue (Enquiry - first)

BUSINESS MEETING

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

Project Updates:

1799 West King Edward	Renovation and Retention: Decision delayed
1998 Cedar Crescent	New House: Application received
3333 Cedar Crescent	Renovation and Retention: Application received
1550 Marpole Avenue	Renovation and Retention: Application received
1426 Angus Drive	Renovation and Retention: Application received
1645 W King Edward Ave.	New House: Application expected
3780 East Blvd.	New House: Application expected
3689 Selkirk Street	Enquiry: Landscape and external works to pergola
1527 Angus Drive	Enquiry: Minor renovation
3660 East Blvd.	Landscape Review & By-law Enforcement notified

Review of minutes:

N/A

The Panel considered two applications and one enquiry for presentation

1.	Address:	1664 Cedar Crescent
	Description:	New house proposal
	Review:	Application - fourth
	Architect:	Loy Leyland Architect
	Delegation:	Loy Leyland, Donna Chomichuk, landscape architect

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (10 in favor, 3 Abstentions, 0 against)

Planning Comments:

This proposal for a new house on a double fronting site with two existing crossings (one on Cedar Crescent and Pine Crescent) was previously reviewed by the Panel as an application on two occasions. Panel commentary at the most recent appearance (March 2014) noted some concerns with the design composition of the front (north) elevation. Design development recommended to address concerns expressed regarding the proposed cupola and whether an alternative solution could be found to create a sense of height.

Questions to Panel:

1. Does the application successfully address previous feedback of the Panel?

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The fenestration on the front elevation has been made more uniform, we changed the floor plan to fit the new window layout. We added subtle details to the windows and made them more symmetrical. The cupola has been changed into a hip roof so it is less of a prominent element. We have reduced the overall scale of the house.

Panel Commentary:

There was positive discussion that the new proposal successfully addresses the previous issues of the Panel.

The concept of integrating the cupola into the roof lines with a hip roof was well liked, with some comments made that the new roof design gives the house a new look. It was commented that the combination of the new roof design and the new window design will be a welcome addition to the neighborhood.

Some concerns remained about the massing of the house and it was noted that the basement was recorded as only 350 sq. ft. when the house sits on a much larger footprint. The house reads as over 7000 sq. ft. which exceeds the allowable space. Some members were concerned that the house is going to look hulking sitting up on the hill, given the size of the garage and the mechanical rooms and crawl space which are not counted in total FSR. It is a large footprint and the house will seem much larger than a 5,800 sq. ft. home.

Panel members complimented the details of the landscape particularly the family friendly design of the south facing back yard. It was noted by more than one member that there are 12 trees being removed with no traditional or native trees proposed as replacements. The consensus was that the landscape works well but the Panel would like to see more trees native to the area. The Panel suggests that healthy trees not within the footprint of the house should be retained.

Chair Summary:

There was much support from Panel members that the applicant listened to and followed the previous Panel advice. The new changes were positively received and it was commented that the house now seems like a stately Shaughnessy home with an eclectic style.

Most of the major issues with the external design of the building have been satisfactorily addressed. This includes the front elevation window alignment and symmetry and the redesign of the cupola to fit better into the existing roofline.

Concerns were expressed with the landscaping in terms of retaining existing trees. It would be appreciated if as many trees as possible were retained.

A major concern still outstanding is the extent of the footprint which some Panel members feel would cause the house to dominate the property to an excessive extent.

The Panel strongly advises the client to engage the services of their design architect through the construction stage. The Panel also recommends that staff seek detailed drawings of all significant exterior features to assist the builders in maintaining the high quality of design and finishes shown in today's presentation.

A motion that the proposal as presented be supported was seconded and passed.

- | | | |
|----|--------------|--|
| 2. | Address: | 1238 Balfour Avenue |
| | Description: | Renovation and Addition to existing Pre-date house |
| | Review: | Application - first |
| | Architect: | Loy Leyland Architect |
| | Delegation: | Loy Leyland architect, Julie Hicks landscape architect |

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (12 in favor, 1 against)

Planning Comments:

Renovation and addition to an existing pre-date house with alterations to the existing two story plus cellar 1911 Queen Anne style home include demolition of the existing detached garage, relocating the building, two story plus cellar addition to the west side, and development of basement 4 car garage accessed from the lane. The existing dwelling is non-conforming in height and side yards, relaxations of the same based on heritage retention is being considered. Additions are in the style of the existing house so differentiation is by means of a lower ridge height and stepping back of the addition on the front elevation. Significant tree removal occurs along the shared east property line to facilitate parking access.

Questions to Panel:

1. Staff are seeking commentary around the general success of the architectural design proposal, particularly as it relates to the retention of the external character of the pre-date dwelling.
2. Staff are also seeking commentary around the success of landscaping proposals as they relate to the provision of two maneuvering areas and consequent tree removal.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

This is a retention project on a pre-date house that is not on the Heritage inventory list. The challenge is that the house is symmetrical in design but in an odd location on the lot. The solution to get the required parking is to remove the existing parking structure and park underneath the house. The house is moved slightly for landscaping and maneuvering. The new addition is in same style as the existing house but secondary to the original house by being set back and at a lower elevation. The foundation of the new addition has been dropped to allow a more contemporary ceiling height. The addition had to spread out along the site to add the square footage required and allow for a covered porch. We are keeping the existing pedestrian crossing.

Landscape:

The new gate and fence will match the style of the existing gate. The existing exposed aggregate wall is in good condition and we plan to retain it. We want to dress up this wall with new lights and with a more robust cap to modernize it while still keeping the heritage character of the wall. Because the house is moving over there is no longer a straight walkway to the front door, the pathway will be curved. We will retain the one Holly tree in the front yard that is in very good condition. The rest of the Holly trees are in very poor condition, they are not good specimens and are really an overgrown hedge rather than trees. The project tries to recreate a beautiful simple garden to go with the restoration of the house.

Panel Commentary:

Members were appreciative of the retention of the dwelling. There was commentary about the challenge of trying to come up with an architectural design that works on a long and narrow property.

There was mixed commentary as to how better address the location of the addition with respect to the existing house. Some members were of the opinion that the house should be relocated to the center of the lot with additions added to both sides. Other members disagreed noting that the

asymmetrical addition saves three sides of house. The prevailing view was in favor of the asymmetrical addition to the house.

There was much discussion about the the length of the addition. Generally it was noted that additions to a heritage house should be compatible and subordinate. The proposed addition was generally not seen as subordinate enough relative to the existing bulk of the house.

It was commented that the FS Design Guidelines call for houses with a verticality that takes up a smaller space on the property which then also lends to the estate-like appeal of the gardens and the landscaping around it.

It was commented that the design of the house would be much improved if the addition were shorter in length. By proposing such a large addition to one side of the house the volume becomes so great that the estate-like appeal of the property is lost. It was commented the present design looks like a freighter with a "Titanic moment" happening on the west balcony.

It was commented that the mechanical room is an excessive size and does not count towards FSR.

A number of members commented regarding the front elevation of the addition, particularly the window and wall surface ratio on the main floor of the addition. The window glass area on the front facade is quite excessive compared to the wall surface for this style of house. It was commented that the second floor windows of the addition look like bathroom windows and that more design work is needed here.

It was commented that reducing the number of columns on the addition would help. There was commentary that the design of the addition could become more creative and whimsical.

It was discussed that keeping the bottom line of windows on the addition in line with the original windows would give the eye a better line to follow. Similarly, it was felt that the base plinth of the addition being lower than the existing house creates incongruity with the original house and looks oddly out of place.

It was discussed that the garage doors need more design work. There was concern about building materials, for example the railing detail at the front looks industrial and insubstantial and it was noted the house would benefit from a higher quality roof material.

With regard to landscape, panel members would like to see more shade trees in keeping with the area. Generally there was no issue with the driveway. The existing fence is not appropriate to keep and should be replaced. There was discussion that Panel members don't like the new maintenance borders along the house that are going up in a lot of First Shaughnessy houses because in FS the house is supposed to be integrated with the landscape. It was suggested the borders be reduced in size as they don't work with the historic style. It was discussed that the western edge of the property is very weak and would benefit from more planting buffers with the neighbours.

Chair Summary:

There have been comments about the windows on the front façade and the second floor on the addition reading as bathroom windows. The second floor windows of the addition could look more significant. More design work needs to be done with the addition particularly with the design of the columns and windows as the present design is not working.

It would be more in keeping with the design of the original house and more respectful of the neighbourhood if the new addition was reduced in length.

The base plinth of the side addition being on a different level than the main house does not work. Perhaps the floor levels of the main house and the addition could be adjusted to better match each other.

The Panel would like to see more shade and evergreen trees that have the opportunity to grow into tall trees to better fit into the neighbourhood.

A motion that this project comes back with comments addressed was passed and seconded.

3.	Address:	1390 Laurier Avenue
	Description:	New house on a Post-Date site
	Review:	Enquiry - first
	Architect:	Loy Leyland Architect
	Delegation:	Loy Leyland architect, Julie Hicks landscape architect

EVALUATION: SUPPORT

Planning Comments:

New house proposed on post-date site at the corner of Laurier Avenue and Cartier. The substance of the enquiry relates to orientation of driveway access. The existing house is addressed off Laurier Avenue but has driveway access from Cartier Avenue. Existing access is bisected by a street tree so some relocation of the crossing could be supported by planning but generally we seek to reuse existing crossings.

Questions to Panel:

1. Staff are seeking particular commentary around the merits of each of the two access options proposed.
2. Staff would also welcome any general commentary on the architectural and landscape proposals illustrated in the enquiry.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The existing driveway crossing is on Cartier but we want to move it to Laurier as we feel this makes more sense. Laurier is the more dominant street. A more compelling reason is the south facing outdoor space and all of the green space going around it which makes for a much more livable house. For the sake of livability on the property we are putting the family room and dining room facing out into the back yard at grade. We plan to work with an arborist to save the boulevard tree and to repair the hedges. The house is Tudor style with a modest entry and half timbering. It is a small site.

Panel Commentary:

On the issue of driveway access, panel members unanimously agreed that the Laurier facing access makes the most sense. In terms of livability, having south facing family spaces makes a lot of sense and moving the driveway facilitates this.

The design was broadly supported: It was noted that if the materials are high grade, this will be a very nice property and a good addition to FS. It was noted that the architectural proposal follows the Guidelines. It was commented this house replaces one of inferior design and construction that should never have been built in FS. The hedge is very significant and we would like to see as much saved as possible.

Chair Summary:

The house and landscape design follow the FSODP and Guidelines. Everyone on the Panel likes the design of the house and the Laurier driveway option. A motion to see the project back as an application was seconded and passed.

Adjournment: There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 6:30 pm.