

FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: June 5, 2014

TIME: 4:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room 116, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE FIRST SHAUGHNESSY DESIGN PANEL:

Hakano Amaya	BCSLA
Dallas Brodie	Vice-Chair, Resident, SHPOA
Donna Chomichuk	BCSLA
Linda Collins	Chair, Resident
Lori Hodgkinson	Resident
Robert Johnson	AIBC
Benjamin Ling	AIBC
Lisa MacIntosh	REBGV
Mollie Massie	Vancouver Heritage
Alastair Munro	Resident, SHPOA
Frank Shorrock	Resident, SHPOA
David Nelson	Resident

CITY STAFF:

Colin King	Development Planner
Tim Potter	Development Planner

LIAISONS:

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

REGRETS:

Hakano Amaya	BCSLA
Erika Gardner	Resident
Peter Kappel	Resident, SHPOA
Lisa MacIntosh	REBGV
Kerri-Lee Watson	Resident

RECORDING

SECRETARY: Dorothy Kerr

1.	3989 Granville Street (Application - first)
2.	3333 Cedar Crescent (Application - first)
3.	1426 Angus Drive (Application - first)

BUSINESS MEETING

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

Business:

On June 10 and 11 City Council will be considering several reports related to the Heritage Action Plan, including a proposed one year temporary protection period for demolition in First Shaughnessy. Speakers are invited.

Project Updates:

3737 Angus Drive	Merit Evaluation in process: Potential A
3651 Osler Street	Merit Evaluation in process: Potential C
1626 Laurier Avenue	Heritage B: Application received
3837 Osler Street	New House: Application received
1998 Cedar Crescent	New House: Application received

Review of minutes:

N/A

The Panel considered three applications for presentation

- | | | |
|----|--------------|--|
| 1. | Address: | 3989 Granville Street |
| | Description: | Proposed new garage |
| | Review: | Application - minor amendment (first) |
| | Architect: | Allan Diamond Architect |
| | Delegation: | Allan Diamond, Damien Oriente, landscape architect |
-

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8 in favor, 1 Abstentions, 0 against)

Planning Comments:

This is a revised proposal for a new garage sited in the front yard of the site. A prior approval was granted under Development Application No. 417932. Access to the garage is from the rear lane. Salient revisions include the following:

- a. Access to the garage is via the gravel driveway
- b. The garage has been enlarged from the approved garage size
- c. Access and maneuvering has been placed in the front yard.

Questions to Panel:

1. Please comment on the revised garage siting and access in terms of its response to the FS ODP.
2. Please comment on the revised landscape design.
3. Please provide any additional comments on the proposal.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

This project has been two years in the making and has gone to the Board of Variance because of the concern about the front yard location of the garage. The Board approved everything the FSADP had approved. However the project has been reconsidered and we would like to regain the south yard. This option benefits the client and the neighbor. The plan is to be able to drive in and park the car adjacent to the kitchen entrance and possibly choose to leave it in the side yard or drive to the garage. The front driveway gate on Granville Street is a convenience gate that would mostly be used for emergency access because entering or backing onto Granville can be dangerous. The yard would be a much more useable space with the garage framing the yard and blocking the sound. By changing the direction of the garage it changes the character of the garden and creates a bigger yard space.

Landscape:

The character of the garage is a soft cottage. The gable end faces the lane with some foundation planting so there is a nicer face to the garden and the lane. The face along Granville Street is extremely thick with greenery and there is little visual access to the site. The garage location provides protection from the noise of Granville Street and opens up the south and west backyard. It takes advantage of an existing concrete driveway which would be replaced with gravel. The driveway becomes semi-formal, semi-soft, and it works with the gentle formality of the house. There will be concrete pads to prevent the tracking of gravel. The covered landscape is well under the allowable impermeable. The new garage placement allows the sunroom to open onto a nice yard. There are a lot of existing Maples and Magnolias and the relocation makes more tree retention possible.

Panel Commentary:

It was suggested the applicant consider a new gate for the Granville Street driveway entrance as the present gate is not in character with the elegance of the house. It was generally commented that the front gate of the house should be a beautiful feature signaling the entrance to the property. There were concerns about the solid appearance of the metal mesh for the gate even though it is perforated. Generally solid type gates are not an approved approach for gates in First Shaughnessy however it was also commented that noise and dust from Granville is a concern here.

There were concerns the garage could become visible from Granville Street if the current hedging were to come down. The big flat garage roof does not relate to the street. It was suggested more design work could be done to give the garage a bit more animation so that it does not present such a blank face in appearance from the street if the hedge were to disappear in the future. Additionally It was commented we would like to see more of the design elements of the house in the garage design.

It was noted that while the gravel driveway is a feature of the landscape design there is an issue with it tracking onto the street and around the property. It was suggested the applicant might consider grass strips at the Granville Street and lane ends of the driveway which might improve the permeability. Another suggestion was to create the driveway from pavers with grass strips between which would help preserve the country feel.

Chair Summary:

The new garage location makes sense and creates a useable back yard, it also helps address the issue of noise from Granville Street which is a big issue in terms of livability. The use of gravel for the driveway was supported by the Panel but we would like to see a nicer driveway gate in the front yard. Because of sound and dust issues from Granville Street the gate may need to be less open in design than if it were located on an interior street.

The Panel suggests the client engage the services of the design architect through the construction stage to ensure the delivery of a high quality project. The Panel recommends that staff seek detailed drawings of all significant exterior features to enable the builders to follow the architect's plans and maintain design quality.

- | | | |
|----|--------------|--|
| 2. | Address: | 3333 Cedar Crescent |
| | Description: | Renovation of existing Pre-date house |
| | Review: | Application (first) |
| | Architect: | Allan Diamond Architect |
| | Delegation: | Allan Diamond and Damien Oriente landscape architect |
-

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7 in favor, 2 abstentions, 1 against)

Planning Comments:

Renovation and addition to existing 1922 dwelling. Merit Evaluation of this property shows that the subject house could potentially be added to the Vancouver Heritage Register as a "C" listed property. Staff concluded that if a retention option was not desired for this site, support could be gained for the applicant to proceed with a new house design, however, incentives to retain would be considered. In the proposed application, the dwelling is retained in original location with minor additions increasing existing non-conformities in siting. Given the specific hardships of the triangular site, a garage in the front yard is being considered by staff.

Questions to Panel:

1. Can the Panel comment on the architectural expression of the proposed garage as it relates to the ODP and Guidelines
2. Is the new edge treatment to Cedar Crescent to replace the existing brick wall sufficiently in line with the ODP and Guidelines?
3. Is the new skylight on the Cedar Crescent elevation an appropriate alteration of the character dwelling?

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

This is not a typical Shaughnessy house. In heritage ratings the house scored a low "C", more for the person who built and lived in the house rather than for its heritage merit. The existing house suits the site as it is long and narrow, and it has lovely spaces inside. Planning has concerns with the application of the ridge skylight. There is an attic of about 600 square feet that has two little eye hole windows on one end, giving very little light. Adding dormers for the extra light would not enhance the house and would change what is already there. The skylights are a good option to add light and they would not be visible from street level.

We want to build a two car garage in the shape of a box which would be treated as a landscape element. The garage is 9' high. The changes to the building are retaining what is now an open porch and turning it into an outdoor living space using French doors to open it out. There will be a new deck off the kitchen space. We would keep all the existing siding. Would like to paint all the brick on the house white to have a monochromatic house. We are planning to have a roof

that looks like zinc but is a rubberized roof with singles on a smaller scale. It is a quirky house on a quirky site.

Landscape:

There is a big Maple tree that the arborist said should go. There's a Spruce that is intertwined with it and the Spruce would stay. There is a brick fence that goes all the way through and looking at FS guidelines, it's not terribly permeable. The front entry has been expanded. The garage is a continuation of the fence element. There is an existing carport to be relocated and the existing paving will be removed. All of the existing planting will be retained. The effort is to make the front of the house look more like the front. There will be a new fence that is a combination of wood with metal inserts. There is an existing gate. We are concentrating on a better front entry and maintaining a sense of space. There are some diagonal views into the property.

Panel Commentary:

It was generally noted that everyone is familiar with the house and is enthusiastic to see it given some life again.

The location of the garage was broadly supported. With regard to the expression of the garage, some panel members encouraged the applicant to pick up some elements of the house and add them to the garage to encourage a dialog between the house and the garage. It was noted that where the garage is facing the house the design could be made softer and more transparent perhaps with a structural trellis with more transparent walls to minimize impact on the short view from the house.

With regard to the issue of the skylights across the ridge of the roofline, there was mixed commentary from the Panel. Some members agreed with the applicant that in perspective in real life you wouldn't see the skylights and they would not be as prominent a feature as they look in the elevations. It was suggested that the skylight structure share a similar color palette to the roof to minimize impact.

It was noted the Guidelines talk about uninterrupted streetscape however the Cedar Crescent elevation has three or four different elements that present a chopped up image. It was commented that the part of the street where this house is does not have any street trees, and so there are no large trees near the house for scale. The landscape across the front elevation consists of hedging and azalea and a low fence which leaves the front of the house very exposed to the street.

The Design Guidelines talk about layering within the landscape to create an interesting view of the house from the street. Some of this has been lost by the removal of the existing brick wall and the addition of more paving. There were comments the applicant should be encouraged to consider the amount of paving in the front yard and whether it enhances the appearance of the house from the street.

Members were disappointed the existing brick wall across the front of the house was not being preserved but understood reasons for removal. Some members would like to see the wall rebuilt as it is a character element of the dwelling. It was generally held that the wood fence was not successful.

The entry sequence drew commentary for the bareness of the patio and lack of a designated path. This was related to the fence design too, the fence needs improvement and some detail is needed on either side of the door, large planters or trees for example.

Regarding retention, at least one member noted that the simplicity of the Dutch Colonial style was being lost by the addition of windows which made it appear more Georgian.

Chair Summary:

There is a lot of support for this project as it is retaining and revitalizing a familiar Shaughnessy house.

There were comments about the skylight and that the metal parts of the skylight should match the color of the roof material in order to make it a less prominent feature. There is support for the skylight feature as it makes the attic space useful. There is support for location of the garage and the materials of the garage. There were comments about the fencing along Cedar Crescent that the fencing could perhaps be continuous and less chopped up. One of the best options for fencing along the property would be the retaining and rebuilding of the existing brick wall which has become a neighborhood heritage landscape feature of this house.

The front entry would benefit from a stronger design perhaps with the addition of large planters and or more trees.

The Panel recommends that the client engage the services of their design architect at the construction stage. The Panel recommends City staff seek detailed drawings of all exterior features to ensure a high quality of approved material and finish.

- | | | |
|----|--------------|---|
| 3. | Address: | 1426 Angus Drive |
| | Description: | Renovation of Existing Pre-date house |
| | Review: | Application (first) |
| | Architect: | Formwerks Architectural |
| | Delegation: | Jim Bussey architect, Claudia Koerner landscape architect |

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9 in favor, 0 against)

Planning Comments:

Renovations and additions to an existing Heritage “C” dwelling. The site is sufficiently large to accommodate infill development, so a secondary pool house is being proposed. Additions are largely sited to the rear and sides of the existing dwelling, with the most significant mass added to the front being the new garage. Façade alterations to the front of the house are also being considered.

Questions to Panel:

1. Staff are seeking Panel commentary around the alterations to the Angus Drive elevations as it relates to both the roof form of the new garage and also the alteration of existing window openings in the heritage façade.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The last time this project was before the Panel it was approved and the Planning Department issued a permit. Construction was started, but a new owner came along and did not like some of the house features and was hoping to make a few changes. As the changes grew it became clear that this would become a new application. This application has advantages over the last one in two major areas: both the architecture and the landscaping have been significantly improved. One of the changes to the front of the house is the addition of a second story turret that is adding to the rather skimpy one there now. The architecture has mostly changed in the back and is far more in keeping with the house. The backyard speaks to the grandness of the house with the large lawn setting and the large pool and pool house. There are two existing dormers which were made larger in the last approved scheme. We have chosen to eliminate them. There were also some 1960's style dormers that were added at the side and we have chosen to eliminate them too in order to bring back the character of a truly grand Angus house.

Landscape:

This is a huge lot. In the front yard we are keeping the port cochere and the driveway with two entrances. In the front yard we are adding a few columnar trees to create a vertical element. Going along the side of the house, there is underground parking on the site so the driveway has to be extended but it will be screened nicely. We are keeping all the existing trees plus adding the theme of columnar Maple trees. Next to the driveway there is a sweeping gravel pathway that runs all along the perimeter of the house underneath lush trees to create an intimate private pathway. Currently the whole backyard is just flat with no trees, hedge or plants. There is a row of existing Cedar trees but they are actually just stumps. They will be removed and replaced with new deciduous as well as evergreen trees to create privacy along the perimeter to the neighbor. It will create a lovely sunny back yard. There is some formality closer to the house but when you get to the edges, it gets more informal.

Panel Commentary:

The Panel broadly supported the revised scheme and were glad that the sixties themed elements were being removed. Most members commented that the extension of the one story turret on the west looks out of place, generally it was felt that the original one story version should be kept. It was commented that if the turret has to be two stories in height the existing window style on the one story turret should be copied all the way up.

The appearance of the garage from the front elevation created much discussion. The bank of smaller windows just above garage drew comments about their lack of design and appropriateness for this house. It was discussed that the glazing in the garage doors should be removed because from the street the view of the doors is not pleasant. The light from all of these garage windows at night would look very unattractive and take away from the elegance of the house. It was also commented that the garage doors could be less modern in design to better suit the house. The scale of the small dormers above the garage was questioned, it was commented the garage could look better with one larger dormer.

It was suggested the long windows at back of the house be broken up into a more Tudor style.

Roofing materials were discussed by a number of members with suggestions including consideration of slate or stone roof finish and wrought iron gates. It was commented that a split cedar shake roof would also be the perfect finishing element for this house.

Regarding detailing, the heavy timbers and brackets are more in keeping with the existing half timbre of the house. The front door may have to stay as it was the original feature of the house, although some members would like to see the door more centered.

The landscape overall is an elegant solution. It was suggested that adding some wider canopy or evergreen trees as well as the more narrow columnar trees would add to the landscape design. The present feel with the columnar trees is very rigid and stilted and soldier-like. The additional canopied trees would provide more softness and cover.

Chair Summary:

There is a lot of support within the Panel for the heritage restoration and renovation of this well known Shaughnessy mansion. The turret is an issue. If the turret must extend to two stories we recommend the existing window style on the one story turret be copied.

The view of the garage doors from Angus Drive would detract from the grandness of the stately house, particularly at night. We recommend the line of windows over the garage be removed and glazing on the garage doors be reduced. If need be the garage windows could be located on the east elevation of the garage rather than across the front of the house.

The roof is a prominent feature of the house when viewed from the street and we would like to see a high quality finish for the roof such as slate, stone or cedar shakes. The high quality roof material would add to the grandness of the Angus house and enhance the streetscape leading to The Crescent.

The landscape is a very elegant solution but would benefit from some wider canopy and evergreen trees.

The Panel recommends that the client engage the services of the design architect at the construction stage to ensure the delivery of a high quality finished project. Additionally, the Panel recommends that City staff seek detailed drawings of all significant exterior features to ensure a high quality project should the project be turned over to builders without the supervision of the architect.

Adjournment:

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 6:45 pm.