

FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: February 4, 2016

TIME: 4:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, Vancouver City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE FIRST SHAUGHNESSY DESIGN PANEL:

Kathy Reichert	Chair, Resident
Peter Kappel	Vice-Chair, Resident, SHPOA
Mollie Massie	Vancouver Heritage Commission
John Madden	Resident
Frank Shorrock	SHPOA
David Nelson	SHPOA
Joanne Giesbrecht	REBGV
Lu Xu	BCSLA
Donna Chomichuk	BCSLA
D’Arcy Jones	AIBC
Tim Ankenmen	AIBC

CITY STAFF:

Anita Molaro	Assistant Director of Planning
Georgina Lyons	Development Planner
Ulla Victor	Development Planner
Marco D’Agostini	Senior Heritage Planner

LIAISONS:

George Affleck	City Councillor
Melissa de Genova	City Councillor
Catherine Evans	Park Board Commissioner

REGRETS: Christopher Richardson Vancouver School Board Liaison

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lidia Mcleod

1. 1263 Balfour Avenue

Business Meeting

Georgina Lyons, Development Planner, called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm and noted the presence of a quorum.

Business:

- Welcome to the returning and new members
- Election of a new chair:
 - Kathy Reichert was elected as Chair
 - Peter Kappel was elected as Vice-Chair
- The Panel discussed the minutes of November 12th, 2015 with Anita Molaro, Assistant Director of Planning. It was moved by Mr. Kappel and was the decision of the Panel:

THAT the Panel, on reviewing the minutes of November 12th, 2015 recognizes that Business point three (3) does not properly indicate the process of the Planning Department, and as such notes that point three should be amended to “3. Even if the panel votes against this project Planning may continue to do our work processing the rezoning application”.

The panel also recognizes on further clarification from City Planning that whenever the project comes back through the development permit process the Panel will review the application and it will meet the HCA requirements at that time.

- Discussion:
 - Heritage Conservation discussion with Marco D'Agostini, Senior Heritage Planner
- Terms of Reference:
 - General Procedure
 - Quorum
 - Bulletin 65

Project Updates:

- Due to time constraints projects updates were deferred to the following meeting.

Review of Minutes:

- November 12th, 2015 - Amended with the proposed wording
- December 3rd, 2015 - Passed with the following amendments:
 - The spelling of Marco D'Agostini's name on Pg. 3 was corrected;
 - The 'projects not included' list was added to the Projects Reviewed section;
 - John Madden was added to the 'Present' list
 - Linda Collin's letter from the FSADP to Mayor and Council regarding the Nov 12th West King Edward panel discussion cannot be posted onto the Vancouver website. Anita Molaro stated that the letter will go council.

The Panel considered one application for presentation

Address: 1263 Balfour
Description: Conservation Proposal
Review: Second
Architect: Loy Leyland
Delegation: Loy Leyland, Julie Hicks

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7 in favor, 0 abstentions, 4 against)

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The applicant introduced the project by going over the history of the project and how previous panel comments have been addressed. This project started a number of years ago when pre-1940s houses could still be demolished. Back then the owners agreed to retain the house with renovations, and applied with a technically supportable application. Since then there have been changes to parking and setback requirements.

The setbacks have been increased a bit, and the house is being moved forward to accommodate the at-grade parking in a detached garage. As such the porte-cochere and house are both a bit narrower.

The double-height space has lowered.

The original window patterns are being retained, and the existing railing patterns are being reused in other places.

The gables are an appropriate response to the new addition, and the new gables will match them. However, the gable roofs in some spots have been switched back to hip roofs.

The mud room has been taken off.

The solution being proposed is very neutral in response to the existing house structure and spirit. As much of the existing house as possible has been retained.

Landscape:

At the front along the street is a proposed railing atop a retained wall. The rhododendrons and a Blue Atlas cedar are to be retained. Shrubs are being added to provide screening and frame the garden. There is also a fountain and additional planting in front of the porte-cochere.

A Honey Locust tree is being planted in the back. The driveway is being retained and a garage being put in. A nicer space is being created in the back with the house being moved forward, with more planting being added to the garden.

The permeable area that remains under the new scheme is identical to the permeability of the existing scheme.

Planning Comments:

This application proposes additions to a protected 1912 Craftsman-style House. The house was assessed through merit evaluation as a 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 foundations.
- 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 the 110ft frontage to Balfour Avenue. The existing house is a Craftsman style, with non-conforming height, sited to the west of the lot, and with a larger than typical front yard. The footprint of the house is four-square with asymmetrical expression of the vertical bay to the east of the front elevation, capped with a secondary roof.

The proposal involves the relocation of the protected building on-site and seeks to capture residual FSR through additions to the rear, and to the east of the dwelling. Previously, the parking was proposed to be relocated under the house. As this is no longer supportable under the new First Shaughnessy regulations, the application now proposes to retain the existing garage.

Panel's primary concerns from the February 12th meeting were:

- The character of the house being lost due to the size/ massing of the addition.
- The loss of character defining elements on unaltered sides compromised the meaningfulness of the retention scheme.
- The double height volumes within the body of the existing dwelling were contributing to the length of the addition to the west (the length of this addition relative to the existing dwelling being a Form of Development issue).
- Landscape improvements to provide a separated pedestrian path and to improve the sunken patio in its impact on, and depth within, the rear yard.

Questions to Panel:

1. Does the revised proposal sufficiently address previous panel commentary?

As the proposal has substantially changed since its previous panel appearance, due to the regulatory changes in First Shaughnessy, Staff are seeking commentary from the panel as follows:

2. General commentary on form of development and architectural [sic] of the addition as it relates to the protected building.
3. Specific commentary on how the horizontal massing of the addition relates to the protected building.

Panel Commentary:

The panel thanked the application team for their presentation and noted that, in general, this project is supportable. However, the change of the house orientation towards the street is not great.

Panel members were divided on whether the porte-cochere placement was appropriate. While all the panelists noted that the asymmetry of the house was lost with the porte-cochere placement, some members thought that it added a stately quality to the house with the new centre. Other members thought that the original asymmetry of the house (the broad off-centre front porch is listed as a CDE in the house's SOS) was an essential heritage character defining element (CDE), and this CDE would be lost with the addition of a porte-cochere to the front façade. Changing the front of the house would remove its heritage character and value, and not follow the HCA Guidelines. It was also noted that this house has a high B value according to the Vancouver Heritage Register evaluation.

The panel also thought that as much as possible other key heritage characteristics should be retained. These include the fireplaces, chimneys, and the original foundation windows. It is hoped that the floral pattern art glass windows and doors can be preserved and incorporated into the new design in the rear. In general it would be better if the building could have a more Arts and Crafts-style feel; perhaps by modifying the tops of the windows or by adding more cobbles.

The west-side house has a lot of angles and things going on, more clarity is needed. The lack of dormer makes the west elevation disappear a bit more in a good way. The addition on the west could be a bit smaller to reduce the massing. Gable ends are a tradition of the house, and these are being lost. A good gable or hip end would help break down the massing.

The addition on the east elevation is a very two-dimensional façade. Adding a dormer or replacing the windows would help

The large horizontal roof looks too large in scale to the existing house; the massing is simply too bulky. Re-consider the rotunda as it butts against the rest of the character of the house.

The loss of the large front lawn is lamentable, and the new lawn is not of the grand scale. The lawn should be increased in order to add a more estate-like feel to the site. The planting layer which was added in the front gives more privacy and works well though. From the rear perspective, the railing has changed and the wall has gone down, but it could go down a bit more.

Chair Summary:

There were comments about the foundation windows and how they should remain; new windows should respect the original windows. The chimney should also be retained as it is a heritage feature. The rotunda does not match the house. The package submitted looks great. The west-side extension has too large of a massing. The lines of the house are generally cleaner than the original. Character defining elements in the front have been changed too much with the addition of the porte-cochere, although some people thought that it helped the character. The landscape changes generally look good, but there was concern over the loss of the front lawn and the new orientation of the house to the street.

Applicant's Response:

The loss of the front lawn is a product of the porte-cochere, but with some modifications to the planting in front the lawn could be enlarged a bit. But there is not much more room for improvement.

The chimney and foundations windows can probably be retained. The roofing material is appropriate for the area. The rotunda is a request by the client and does not offend the overall scheme, so hopefully it can be kept. Retaining the stained glass windows is a lovely idea.

The addition on the west is respectful to the rest of the house, and anything done to it seems to dilute the existing house. It could be tied in better with the existing house, but really to retain the existing house the addition needs to be neutral such as it is now.

The porte-cochere adds a more estate-like quality and works fine; it could not work on the side.

Adding the octagonal shape back to the west could be possible and would add back in a lot of character. On the east putting in a bay window, or something with more interest, is definitely possible.

Overall this project has come a long way.

Adjournment:

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 6:25 pm.