

**FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES**

**DATE:** July 17, 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
Erika Gardner	Resident
Robert Johnson	AIBC
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

**CITY STAFF:**

Colin King	Development Planner
------------	---------------------

**LIAISONS:**

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

**REGRETS:**

Lori Hodgkinson	Resident
Kerri-Lee Watson	Resident

**RECORDING**

**SECRETARY:** Dorothy Kerr

---

<b>ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING</b>	
1.	3837 Osler Street (Application first)
2.	1626 Laurier Ave. (Application second)
3.	1550 Marpole Ave. (Application third)

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Collins called the meeting to order at 4:10 pm and noted the presence of a quorum.

Business:

Heritage Action Plan Reports June 11th, 2014: Temporary Protection Order was put in place.

FSR Exclusion in the FS ODP was outlined by Colin King.

Project Updates:

1998 Cedar Crescent      New House: Application Unscheduled

1451 Angus Drive        Standards & Maintenance By-law

1238 Balfour              Prior-to Approval

Review of minutes:

The minutes from April 24, May 15, June 5, 2014 were voted on and approved.

---

**The Panel considered three applications for presentation**

---

- |    |              |  |
|----|--------------|--|
| 1. | Address:     | <b>3837 Osler Street</b>                                       |
|    | Description: | New house on Post-Date Site                                    |
|    | Review:      | Application - first  |
|    | Architect:   | Loy Leyland Architect  |
|    | Delegation:  | Loy Leyland, Lena Chorobik Viewpoint Landscape<br>Architecture |
- 

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (11 in favor, 0 against)**

---

**Planning Comments:**

This is a proposal for a new house on a post-date site on the west side of Osler Street. Parking is at main floor level on the south side yard directly accessed from the lane. Dedicated pedestrian access is provided from Osler Street. Landscape proposals assume removal of a number of fruit trees in the rear yard supported by the arborist report.

**Questions to Panel:**

1. Does the form of development proposed successfully engage with the FS ODP & Guidelines especially as it relates to tripartite expression and the provision of a substantial roof form?
2. Can the Panel offer commentary around landscape proposals, specifically with regard to the relationship between the lawn, deck, and sunken patio in the rear yard; also regarding the provision of a surface parking space along the lane frontage?

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The style of the house is Georgian, with the symmetry of that style and a strongly tripartite expression with the granite base and rough stucco. It is a very tight site and as a consequence it is difficult to achieve the allowable floor space for this relatively small house. Parking at grade takes a bite out of useable area. The house is symmetrical and driven by the setbacks and the square footage. It has all the elements of a larger house scaled down. The detailing is robust in wood.

**Landscape:**

The trees are being retained. There is a large oak, a cherry and a magnolia tree. There is a strong presence of the existing large trees along the front. We are proposing a low stone wall along the frontage with a low metal fence. There is quite a substantial lawn at the front and there is a circular path around the house. There is a main living area along the back, slightly raised with an easy connection to the garden where there is a lawn and planting. We are proposing a new fence along the north side and large shrubs for privacy along the back where some of the privacy would be taken out by the removal of the existing trees. There are two additional surface parking spaces. There is a sliding vehicular gate. The finished grades are adjusted so the entire area is level which could act as an additional play space for children. The whole yard is fenced. We are proposing a mix of broad leaf evergreen and deciduous shrubs. The paths are concrete pavers. There is a basement patio which would have some planters so the frontage of the patio would be greened by some shade tolerant plants. Both patios are connected with the parking spaces by walks and stepping stones.

**Panel Commentary:**

There was discussion about the challenge of trying to create a grand presence on a small lot like this one. To this end it was discussed that the tripartite expression has been attained as much as it can be with the size of the lot.

The overall style is fine and the only concern is that the building be enriched with interesting detail, texture and color and be partially screened with landscaping from direct view from the street.

There were comments about the sunken patio needing to be bigger to make it a more useable space with less of a prison feel. The patio looks confined with straight walls which could be improved by having terrace planting on the outer side of the sunken patio.

There was talk about the garage door being overpowering in design and that it does not fit into the First Shaughnessy neighborhood. The garage door faces onto the lane and is visible only from a side view of the house.

There was discussion that the parking layout would cause too many cars to be visible from the street. The Design Guidelines call for limited visibility of cars from the street. The project has two car parking, and then two cars along the lane. It's normally the principle that only one car should be visible from the street.

There was much discussion about the need for more landscape work. The front needs more layering and filigree. The house will be quite open and not really framed by anything, more trees and landscaping would help. The front entry needs more work in terms of landscaping. Perhaps more flowering trees, something more welcoming and some more shrubs.

**Chair Summary:**

It is recognized this is a small lot and the project is limited by the size of the lot. The design of the house was generally well received and this proposal fits within the Guidelines. The principle building is comparable in scale and massing to the other buildings on the street. The pitch of the roof works well with the house design. The front yard landscaping needs more layering and filigree work and the entrance needs more landscaping. There were comments about the gate and fence being aluminum powder coated black, wrought iron would be a better material.

The Panel recommends to the applicant that the architect remain with project through construction for quality control of the project. The Panel recommends City staff seek detailed architectural drawings of significant exterior features of this home, this is to ensure a quality finished product when the plans are handed over to a builder.

---

2.	Address:	<b>1626 Laurier Avenue</b>
	Description:	Renovation and Addition to existing Pre-date House
	Review:	Application - second
	Architect:	Formwerks Architecture
	Delegation:	Jim Bussey Architect and Claudia Koerner Landscape Architect

---

Delegation: **EVALUATION: SUPPORT (11 in favor, 0 against)**

---

**Planning Comments:**

The Panel previously gave unanimous support (January 30th) to an enquiry for the proposed retention of and additions to this existing 1913 Heritage B house. Previous commentary focused on the rear yard and elevation with concerns around the car-dominance of the landscape design to the rear and a lack of connectivity from the house to the rear yard as well as the composition of the rear elevation, especially in the roof profiles. External expression has been revised to remove the column and rail expression of new and existing additions and add chimneys, remove the turret feature to the south west corner and extend second floor decks, and reduce articulation on the rear elevation.

**Questions to Panel:**

1. Can the Panel offer commentary around the external expression of the north elevation as it relates to the relationship between old and new elements?
2. Do proposed architectural and landscape designs successfully engage with the FS ODP & Guidelines and previous Panel commentary?

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The primary exercise is to retain an existing house that had major renovations. There was a large addition wing added around 1980 and also a side addition. We are keeping the original expression of Dutch Colonial style of the house to have these two wings. We didn't want to take one off so added the other to balance it out to make it symmetrical as is the original expression. The minor modifications that occurred from last time at the Panel are that the turret was removed and the rear of the house was made more symmetrical in design. We removed the front driveway in favor of the direct request of the owners to have a circular driveway in the back which provides adequate hard landscaping for basketball and provides the ingress and egress that the owners

are looking for. The other green space is a symmetrically arranged lawn in the back which is primarily used for a badminton court. There is some seating and a water feature.

**Landscape:**

The front yard has big existing rhododendrons and a large oak tree and small existing trees. We would like to keep these so we are going to move the rhododendrons that are currently in the front of the house to the side and replant along the edges to create a nice lush experience. We will keep the big oak tree and the smaller trees. There is an existing granite wall along the street that we would like to keep but because we are moving the driveway we have to alternate the finish of the wall which means we have to add portions to the wall but by matching the same look. The main feature is the house which is very symmetrical and we want to use this expression in the landscape design. Along the sides of the house is an informal pathway surrounded by trees, very intricate, very west coast, lots of rhododendrons, very lush and green. The back yard is very sunny and big. Moving the house gives a backyard that wasn't there before. There is hard space but still a lot of green in the center in line with the symmetry of the house. In terms of the expression, we are adding a lot of trees, more informal on the side and more formal in the back in line with the house.

**Panel Commentary:**

It was generally commented that this is a really nice project. The additions on either side are well done. The fact that they are set back with a hipped roof creates a nice relationship to the neighbourhood. The additions are set back which subordinates them to the original heritage house which is one of the things that we strive for in a heritage renovation. The scale of windows of the addition help to subordinate addition to the original. One comment was that the window proportion is perfect.

It was noted that our previous concerns were addressed and now the house seems to have a lot more balance. It was discussed that there is a nice sense of solidity to the house with the chimneys on either side. It makes it feel a little more contained rather than with additions appearing to hang out there.

There was discussion that the landscaping is lush and full and in keeping with the Guidelines and that the backyard landscaping makes a nice connection with house. The landscaping in the front yard was well received.

Conversely there were other comments about the horseshoe shaped driveway at the rear of the house looking like a traffic circle without much connection to the house. There were comments that the driveway material could be something more permeable to make it feel more like a walking space and less of a driveway.

**Chair Summary:**

Thank you for addressing our comments from last time. This is a very nice and well received project and the additions are well done. People like the hip roof, it's a nod to the neighbourhood with similar roofs in the neighbourhood. The scale of windows on the addition help make the addition more subordinate to the house. There were comments on the design of the house that it used to look a bit more piece meal and now it looks more solid as a design. There have been really positive changes. The Panel recommends to the applicant that the architect remain with project through construction for quality control of the project. It is further recommended that City staff require detailed architectural drawings of significant exterior features of this home for any builder who might work on the project without the supervision of the architect.

- 
- |    |              |  |
|----|--------------|--|
| 3. | Address:     | <b>1550 Marpole Avenue</b>                                   |
|    | Description: | Renovation and Addition to Heritage B House                  |
|    | Review:      | Application - third  |
|    | Architect:   | Formwerks Architecture                                       |
|    | Delegation:  | Jim Bussey Architect and Claudia Koerner Landscape Architect |
- 

Delegation: **EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7 in favor, 4 against)**

---

**Planning Comments:**

Panel previously supported a pre-application enquiry (January 9th) to retain and renovate an existing 1910 Heritage B dwelling. The existing dwelling will be relocated forward of existing siting to allow additions on each wing within required setbacks. Both relocation of the existing dwelling and reconfiguration of driveway access will result in loss of existing trees; however, significant trees along the street frontage of the property will be retained. Panel expressed concerns around the institutional look and size of the proposal, side yard setbacks, and double height ceilings which would improve the authenticity of the heritage presentation.

**Questions to Panel:**

1. Do proposed architectural and landscape designs successfully engage with the FS ODP & Guidelines and previous Panel commentary?
2. With regard to the scale and setback of the proposed addition to the east, does it provide sufficient differentiation to retain the character of the Heritage B dwelling when viewed from Marpole Avenue?

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The scale of the existing house has been retained with additions on the side. The gables have been moved further back. The front of the property is so dense with trees that the additions to the house can't be seen from the street. The additions are not too large for this house.

**Landscape:**

Big existing trees make a lush and dense impact in the front yard. We are keeping the existing shape of the driveway. There is an informal pathway alongside the house and a formal garden in the back with evergreens providing screening from the neighbors. Because of elevation changes we have created terraces in the gardens. There is a big lawn area in the center of the front yard and patios to catch the west and south sun.

**Panel Commentary:**

Many Panel members found the model to be very helpful and a better representation of the house than the drawings. The model showed the elegance of the house design within the landscape. It was noted that the huge trees allow for a large scale of house.

Some Panel members found the house design to be not in keeping with original building. There were comments about the house not conforming to the neighbourhood.

Some Panel members were originally concerned about massing but said that with the model they could now see the grandness of property.

It was discussed that the side additions were too large and if viewed from the street they would be overpowering. In looking at the model we saw that because of the number of large trees in the front yard this house cannot be seen as a whole from the street. The house is hidden behind the trees and is situated a long way inside the property and above the street.

There were many comments that the massing is too big and the side yards too small. It was stated that with the house going right out to the edges of the side yards there would be a neighborhood problem if everyone did this. The fear was expressed that the side neighbors could do the same thing creating the appearance of two or three huge houses very close to each other.

One Panel member who walked the property commented that the side yard additions to the house are set back from the front elevation and that the adjoining two side properties have already been developed. Therefore in reality it is very unlikely a house could be built right beside this one. He noted there are large green spaces on the neighboring properties at the sides of this project. The existing neighboring green spaces makes the side yards appear larger than they are. It was stated that with the many big trees the neighbors seemed far away and that privacy concerns had been addressed.

It was noted the site planning here is wonderful and that this is a great project.

There were comments that the patio doors at the living room fronting onto the pool would benefit with a roof over them for weather protection.

The retention of the house was applauded.

**Chair Summary:**

The model in this case has made a big difference to understanding the project. This is a unique piece of property for it's size of just under an acre and for the adjacent neighboring properties of the roughly the same size. The project meets the neighborliness requirements of the Guidelines as it fits in with it's neighbours as they are huge properties as well.

There were concerns about massing with the huge house and narrow side yard setbacks. However this project should be seen as a special and unique case as the visual side yards are much larger than those defined by the side property lines. Generally we do not want to see houses designed to reach the maximum side yard setbacks as they can overpower the neighborhood. However in this case due to the fact that the neighboring properties have already been developed and the fact that they are so large and there are so many very tall trees the project works. One constructive comment was that the glass doors at the rear of the house would benefit from an overhang to help protect from rain getting into the house.

The Panel recommends to the applicant that the architect remain with project through construction for quality control. The Panel recommends City staff seek detailed architectural drawings of significant exterior features of this home, this is to ensure a quality finished product if the plans are handed over to a builder without the supervision of the architect.

**Adjournment:** There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 6:40 pm.