

FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: December 11, 2014

TIME: 4:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, Vancouver City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE FIRST SHAUGHNESSY DESIGN PANEL:

Hanako Amaya	BCSLA
Donna Chomichuk	BCSLA
Linda Collins	Chair, Resident
Erika Gardner	Resident
Peter Kappel	Resident, SHPOA
Richard Keate	Vancouver Heritage
Alastair Munro	Resident, SHPOA
David Nelson	Resident
Frank Shorrock	Resident, SHPOA
Kerri-Lee Watson	Resident

CITY STAFF:

Colin King	Development Planner
Georgina Lyons	Development Planner
Tim Potter	Development Planner

REGRETS:

LIAISONS:

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

Dallas Brodie	Vice-Chair, Resident, SHPOA
Lori Hodgkinson	Resident
Robert Johnson	AIBC
Benjamin Ling	AIBC
Lisa MacIntosh	REBGV
Mollie Massie	Vancouver Heritage

RECORDING

SECRETARY: Lidia Mcleod

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 1998 Cedar Crescent (Application second)

BUSINESS MEETING

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

Business:

2014 year end project summary:

1. 2071 W. King Edward Avenue	New house
2. 3743 Cypress Street	New house
3. 1664 Cedar Crescent	New house
4. 1868 West 17th Avenue	New house
5. 1390 Laurier Avenue	New house
6. 3989 Granville Street	New house
7. 1126 Wolfe Avenue	New House
8. 1198 Balfour Avenue	New house
9. 1568 Matthews Avenue	New House
10. 1645 West King Edward Avenue	New House
11. 1998 Cedar Crescent	New House
12. 3989 Angus Drive	Retention
13. 1626 Laurier Avenue	Retention
14. 1550 Marpole Avenue	Retention
15. 1799 West King Edward Avenue	Retention
16. 1490 Balfour Avenue	Retention
17. 1238 Balfour Avenue	Retention
18. 3333 Cedar Crescent	Retention
19. 1738 Angus Drive	Retention
20. 1250 Wolfe Avenue	Retention
21. 1426 Angus Drive	Retention
22. 3837 Osler Street	Retention

- Twenty-two projects reviewed with an even split between new dwellings and retention schemes.
- Three of the eleven new houses were on pre-date sites with 1 site identified as a potential C.

- In 2014 there were 4 meeting cancellations, 2 due to lack of projects and 2 to a lack of quorum.
- Four projects were not supported by Panel and required return trips: all were new dwellings.

Heritage Action Plan

Tim Potter presented some ideas for discussion with respect to the First Shaughnessy ODP and the Heritage Action Plan.

Project Updates:

1888 Matthews Avenue (formerly 3890 cypress Street)	DE received - Retention
3989 Pine Crescent	DE received - Minor addition
1068 Laurier Avenue	DE received - New house post date

Review of minutes:

N/A

The Panel considered one application for presentation

- Address: **1998 Cedar Crescent**
 Description: New house on Pre-Date Site
 Review: Application - second
 Architect: Loy Leyland Architect Inc.
 Delegation: Piotr Dziejowski, Julie Hicks Viewpoint Landscape Architecture

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (0 in favor, 7 against)

Planning Comments:

New House on site of Pre-Date dwelling arising from the overturning of a refusal on policy grounds by Board of Variance. Site has no lane access and features a 15ft grade change from lane down to street frontage. The house presents a primary street facing gable roof form with a secondary vertical element expressed as a copper roofed turret. Tree removal is anticipated in the front yard to the east adjacent to driveway and in the west side yard. The project was reviewed on October 30th, 2014 and did not get support of the panel.

Questions to Panel:

1. Does the form of development proposed successfully engage with previous commentary of the FSADP?

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

In order to get rid of the feeling of a tower low-sloped craftsman gables have been added. The pavement in front has also been wrapped around the structure allowing for a larger porch which further hides the turret element. The heights of the windows have been changed, and brackets have been added to the gables which reflect panel commentary. A different window shape has been substituted for the second story living room window at the front of the house.

Landscape:

A granite wall at the front of the property is to be repaired and retained, with a small section removed in order to widen the driveway. A tree has been added to the front corner of the site which adds interest. However it is recommended that this tree be moved as a large laurel hedge on the corner of the site is already providing shadow and screening. A planting strip has been added at the base of the wall by the auto-court in order to grow Boston ivy up and over the wall, which will provide a green edge. Additional planting has been added to the front and back yards to soften the rectangular feel and provide additional screening. The west property line has a hedge with planting in front of a wall, and has potential for a row of columnar trees if the panel wishes. The Chinese pavilion was a specific request of the client, and should not be visible from the street as it is screened by columnar trees. The rest of the planting provides a low-maintenance garden with seasonal interest.

Panel Commentary:

There were comments about the Panel being presented with unfinished plans in the form of a rough sketch. There are significant differences between the presented sketches and the CAD drawings. There were comments that this was not the Applicant's A game and that the Application in terms of form and content was not good enough.

There was discussion about the turret shape. Although the outside form of the turret has been hidden, the octagonal shape remains and still doesn't work well with the house. It appears the turret roof had merely been removed without adequate design input.

Massing is still an issue. The double height ceilings have remained and still create a false façade. The mechanical room is unnecessarily large and appears to just bulk up the building. The crawl space also adds to the overall massing of the house.

There was repeated commentary that cedar shingles would give the roof a more craftsman look and would appear higher end than asphalt.

The added windows on the lower level take away from the strength of the house as they cut up the tripartite expression. The double-height window in the front is not quite satisfactory, and needs to better reflect the craftsman style as well as be better proportioned. The back windows read as rancher style and need to be re-designed. Windows on the upper section of the turret now appear to taper, giving an exaggerated 'U' shape to the roofline.

There are concerns that the window well at the front of the house will still be very dark and will collect decaying vegetation. The front entrance itself still needs to be addressed as the glass panels are not craftsman – side lights are ok, but windows should not go over the top of the door.

In terms of landscape more large trees are needed. The pagoda still doesn't match anything else and needs a change in details or materials in order to connect it to the main building. The driveway itself could be curved to soften it, and requires more landscape buffer in order to create cohesion. In general the site needs more mid-height and taller vegetation as the current trees do not add much to the First Shaughnessy canopy.

Chair Summary:

This property currently holds a pre-date house which makes the design standards higher. In this case in particular you have a responsibility to bring us your best game, your A game. This presentation appears as a rehash of old plans with a quick sketch pulled together seemingly at the last minute. At the FSADP we are looking for excellence in architecture not a presentation that appears to check all the boxes with no originality or spark. The Panel requires a measure of respect in terms of quality of presentation.

This is an unfinished presentation – the differences between the sketches and the CAD drawings are too much. The panel needs to see finalized plans. Though the sketches are more in-line with panel commentary, approval cannot be given to sketches. The computerized drawings will need to be re-worked with more detail and design issues addressed and presented again.

It is disappointing that there are no changes to the massing and its form of function. The double-height space is a concern. It appears that Panel comments from the previous meeting about massing have been ignored.

The turret shape remains, even with the dome gone, and isn't craftsman. The strong stone base should add to the tripartite expression, but is compromised by too many windows. The front half-moon window is an artificial window; the rear windows at the back are rancher windows and not craftsman. With respect to landscaping the property needs more mid-height vegetation and large evergreen trees.

To facilitate quality control it is the Panel's preference is that the architect be retained through to the final completion of this project and that detailed construction drawings of all exterior features be required for any builder who might work on this project without the supervision of the architect.

Adjournment:

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 5:50 pm.