

FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: February 12, 2015

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
Lori Hodgkinson	Resident
Robert Johnson	AIBC
Lisa MacIntosh	REBGV
Mollie Massie	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

LIAISONS:

George Affleck	City Councillor
Melissa de Genova	City Councillor

REGRETS:

Dallas Brodie	Vice-Chair, Resident, SHPOA
Erika Gardner	Resident
Peter Kappel	Resident, SHPOA
Benjamin Ling	AIBC

RECORDING

SECRETARY: Lidia Mcleod

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | 1263 Balfour Avenue (Application first) |
| 2. | 1999 Cedar Crescent (Application third) |
| 3. | 1068 Laurier Avenue (Application first) |

BUSINESS MEETING

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

Business:

Staffing update:

Cancellation of March 5th meeting, next meeting March 26th with new members.

HAPL Update from Marco D’Agostini, Don Luxton and Tanis Knowles Yarnell.

Project Updates:

1620 Laurier Avenue	New house & demolition approved FSADP 2011
3786 Pine Crescent	Re-submission expected

Review of minutes:

January 22, 2015 Passed with amendment

The Panel considered three Applications for presentation

1. Address: **1263 Balfour Avenue**
 Description: Renovation and addition to Pre-Date house
 Review: Application - first
 Architect: Loy Leyland
 Delegation: Loy Leyland, Julie Hicks

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (0 in favor, 10 against)

Planning Comments:

Additions to Pre-Date 1912 Craftsman-style Inventory House assessed through merit evaluation as potential B listing. Character defining elements identified include:

- broad, off-centre front porch
- overhanging, bracketed eaves
- half-timbered gables
- original windows with small diamond lighted panes over large sashes; stone columns and foundation
- tall and prominent stone chimneys
- Octagon-pattern shingle cladding on the entire wall plane of the exterior
- Stone wall and gateposts along street frontage

The dwelling has no lane access and two existing vehicular crossings on 110ft frontage to Balfour Ave. Existing house is Craftsman style with non-conforming height, sited to the west of the lot with a larger front yard than typical. Footprint of the house is four-square with asymmetrical expression of vertical bay to the east of the front elevation capped with a secondary roof.

The proposal relocates the dwelling onsite and seeks to capture residual FSR on-site through additions to the rear and east of the dwelling. An existing garage is removed and parking relocated to basement accessed via existing crossing. The new layout includes substantial double-height volumes within the body of the retained house and in the new volume to the west. Alterations to the main elevation include addition of port-cochère; relocation of the entry and alteration of the front porch and addition of an oval window. New additions to rear and east are in craftsman style and setback with a lower ridge height to differentiate from original mass. Substantial alterations are proposed to the east elevation. Existing wall to street is retained with new iron fence above.

Questions to Panel:

1. Staff are seeking panel commentary on the form of development of the proposed additions to the pre-date dwelling as it relates to an engagement with the aims of the FS ODP & Guidelines in proposed building and landscape designs
2. Staff are seeking specific commentary around the retention of character merit of the pre-date dwelling as it relates to:
 - Proposed changes to the South and East elevations
 - Massing of the additions

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The proposal is to move and re-orient the existing house from the original position. As the current structure is quite small, floor space has also been added to the west elevation. Rock patterning and detailing as seen from the street are to be maintained. Parking is underground, with the driveway meant to be in a Craftsman/Edwardian style. As the shingles are very unique their style is to be maintained.

Landscape:

A blue Atlas cedar and the existing fence are to be retained. The proposed driveway comes along the east side and has been moved forward to avoid impacting a neighbor's tree; a holly cedar hedge also exists along the east property line. The rock wall at the front of the house is to be retained; the railings and gates are to be replaced. It is proposed to build a new post and widen the gateway at the front, then create a new garden bed with new planting to provide more screening to the front yard. It is also proposed to add screening and a bench to the port-cochère. A mature London plane tree and beech tree along the side are to be protected. The backyard features a pond and waterfall, with planting around the edges to screen. The exposed aggregate on the existing driveway is to be removed and replaced with unit pavers.

Panel Commentary:

There was positive commentary about the retention of the existing driveway and the front yard trees. However, there is concern about the intention to lift and move the house.

There were comments that the interior and exterior of this house will be removed so this really is a demolition not a retention.

There was discussion that the original house is very gracious and should be retained as it is. It was noted the character of the house is being lost and that the proposed massing does not compliment the house. The proposed large wing on one side is too large. This proposal appears to violate the heritage character of the house.

The massing of the house appears maxed-out, with the size no longer complimenting the property. Various tricks have been used to make the house read far larger than it is which compromises any meaningful retention. Although new construction should be subordinate to the

current structure, the current proposal overwhelms the site and causes the house to lose its verticality and asymmetry.

There doesn't appear to be much in the way of character retention. There should be more original windows retained, and more Arts and Crafts adornments. The original south façade should be respected, with its charming asymmetrical appearance and front entrance. Proposed colors seem too bright and jarring and the materials do not appear to be of high quality.

On the west elevation too many competing angles and rooflines are confusing as there is nothing upon which to focus the eye. The east elevation is long and could use more gable or wall articulation. The site could use more planting. In the back the sunken patio seems to create a gigantic hole, while the rest of the back yard doesn't really add anything to the project.

Chair Summary:

The panel likes that the big trees and the front yard are being retained, and that the existing shingles are being replicated so that the idea of the original shingles is retained.

There is concern with the project being too much of a new house rather than the retention of the original character heritage house. The panel feels that the house has been tricked out to create as much square-footage as possible. It is a shame to move the house and lose the original elements including the careful placement of the house within the landscaped lot.

The current garage is quite attractive, and if it were to be retained it might help to moderate some of the massing in the new house. Any additions to this character house could preferably be to the rear of the house. This is because the asymmetry of the front elevation is part of the charm of this house. With the proposed additional massing this house now reads as over 12,000 square feet.

The color scheme reads as too bright, and the proposed round window doesn't belong. The panel would like to see the beautiful and original leaded windows on the east elevation retained. The project is not in support of the FS ODP and guidelines as it is not a retention proposal.

- | | | |
|----|--------------|------------------------------|
| 2. | Address: | 1998 Cedar Crescent |
| | Description: | New house on a Pre-Date site |
| | Review: | Application - third |
| | Architect: | Loy Leyland |
| | Delegation: | Loy Leyland, Julie Hicks |

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (10 in favor, 0 against)

Planning Comments:

New House on site of a 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 originally expressed as a turret but following initial panel review revised to secondary dormer expression. At previous review without quorum in Dec 2014 the

landscape deficiencies in the original review have been generally improved, with the comment that more mid-height vegetation and large evergreen trees are needed.

The panel expressed a desire to see the project return with concerns addressed that included:

- The unfinished nature of the presentation in which materials were not consistent and did not present a coherent project for review, especially as it related to the revised vertical bay
- Too many windows in the stone base that weakened the tripartite expression
- Rancher windows on the rear elevation
- The expression of the double height volume on the north elevation

Review materials include perspective renderings of the revised scheme to better explain the replacement of the turret and how the octagonal shape meets the gable roof.

Questions to Panel:

1. Does the revised proposal sufficiently address previous panel commentary, noting that other than the vertical element most comments are issues of expression rather than form and massing?

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The corner turret has been built up quite extensively by bringing the roof around and creating a gable end, which is in keeping with the rest of the house and is articulated nicely. More stone has been added to the front. The rear elevation has had the window pattern change, with a bit more articulation of the massing and lighter level of detailing. There are also larger roof overhangs and more consistent detailing. .

Landscape:

The landscape is pretty much the same, although a flowering cherry has been added to the front yard. As there is an existing sycamore maple, yew tree, and large street tree there is limited view from the front yard. An existing hedge which overhangs the front yard makes it hard to add more large trees, however one has been added which overhangs the driveway. In the back a golden honey-locust tree and pine tree have been added to give a sense of more height, along with a few trees down the sides. It is not possible to change the shape of the driveway, though a bit more planting has been added. It should be noted that the sunken patio is very accessible for maintenance.

Panel Commentary:

There was commentary the previous concerns of the Panel have been addressed and that the rendering made the house look complimentary to the area. The form and massing were well received. The changes to the house are well incorporated, although the design of the tea house in the back does not fit with the overall design of the house and property.

There is a concern about the window over the living room at the front. Reducing it in size or adding shingles underneath may minimize the impact of the double-height space and add a sense of verticality. Reducing the size of the basement windows would provide a further sense of verticality and add stability to the house. The design of the rake windows does not read well as they do not embody the First Shaughnessy character.

Landscaping does not relate well to the main structure, and the pedestrian access could be moved in order to create more space in the driveway. The design of the lights beside the front door are attractive, but the lights along the top of the front door are not and should be removed.

Chair Summary:

The consensus of the panel is that a lot of the previous concerns have been met. There is a hope that the rugged granite will be kept to add material strength to the project. One area of concern is the window treatment, particularly with respect to the front elevation window on the second floor. This window could be narrower to make it smaller to help alleviate the perception of over massing with this house. Overall it is a handsome house and complimentary to the neighbourhood.

3.	Address:	1068 Laurier Avenue
	Description:	New house on a post-date site
	Review:	Application - first
	Architect:	Loy Leyland
	Delegation:	Loy Leyland, Julie Hicks

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (10 in favor, 0 against)

Planning Comments:

New House proposed on post-date mid-block site with lane access and 75ft frontage to Laurier Ave. Parking is located in the basement and accessed via ramp from the lane along the east side yard. Tree removal proposed along this edge constitutes approved tree removal on adjacent development permit, with additional tree proposed in this application. Other proposed tree removal is accompanied by arborist report and will be reviewed through process. The design rationale describes the style employed in the new house as 'Shaughnessy Tudor Style'. The proposed design features a substantial roof form, tripartite expression facilitated by the lowering of grades adjacent to the house to express the stone base more fully; and symmetrical massing of secondary street facing gables. The double height living space is expressed as a vertical element under the projecting gable; the other gable is bisected by the primary roof.

Questions to Panel:

1. Staff are seeking panel commentary on the form of development of the proposed dwelling as it relates to the aims of the FS ODP & Guidelines in proposed building and landscape designs.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

There is an existing grade change between the front and the rear. The form is quite unique to the property and allows for better integration of the two story space and a recessed covered area. In the back where the deck is, the roof is setback from the edge. A skirt roof is integrated with the massing to provide privacy, and a recessed deck is present at the back.

Landscape:

The front of the house has a very overgrown hedge, while the rear yard is also quite overgrown at the back. There are a number of trees in poor condition which are being removed to prevent

problems, and a dogwood which is being retained. A new wall wraps around the west side and joins into the fencing, with a pedestrian gate stepped back from the sidewalk. The front yard is enclosed with linear and foundation planting. The west side yard is treated as a plated garden with trees, stones, and a bench. The side yard has security fencing. The backyard is a contained feature with the patio and pool. There is also a Horse chestnut, and a cherry tree. There will be a wall and fence along the lane to give it a more formal look. The east side uses columnar trees to provide a screen between the house and any new, adjacent, projects. A nice set of stairs will join the front and back gardens.

Panel Commentary:

This project was well received with positive comments about how the house fits into the neighbourhood. The massing was applauded for how it fits into the streetscape and with the FS ODP.

There is a good start to the house, but the color scheme needs to change to prevent repetition within the neighbourhood. There is a red house in a similar style and the same color a few houses away. The house could benefit from more permeable space and more planting, especially in the backyard.

On the north elevation the panels look French and need to be removed. The upper story windows also need to be stepped back as the vertical face seems too strong compared to the pulled-back balcony. The detailing on the façade should be more Tudor in style.

The windows on the west elevation seem small and narrow, and there is too much of a vertical element to the double-height window on the east. This element could be fixed by adding banding to break it up. Overall there could be less glass, although there were no objections to a skylight.

The porch and roof deck were handled well, though an access could be added to the second floor deck. Cedar shingles instead of Duroid would be preferable, along with a more rounded front entryway to add softness.

Chair Summary:

This project was well received with positive comments about the house design. The massing was applauded for how it fits into the streetscape and with the FS ODP.

The windows on the west elevation appear small, and could be enlarged. Mullions could be added to the vertical windows on the east elevation. The color of the house could be changed from brilliant red to earth tones to better fit in with the FS neighbourhood.

Adjournment:

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 6:35pm