

FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: May 19, 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
Frank Shorrock	SHPOA
David Nelson	SHPOA
Joanne Giesbrecht	REBGV (excused for item #2)
Lu Xu	BCSLA
Donna Chomichuk	BCSLA (excused for item #2)
Tim Ankenmen	AIBC
Michael Leckie	Architect
Mamie Angus	Resident
David Cuan	

CITY STAFF:

Georgina Lyons	Development Planner
Ulla Victor	Development Planner

LIAISONS:

Catherine Evans	Park Board Commissioner
-----------------	-------------------------

REGRETS:

John Madden	Resident
Christopher Richardson	Vancouver School Board Liason
George Affleck	City Councillor
Melissa de Genova	City Councillor

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Camilla Lade

1. 1975 West 18 th Avenue

Business Meeting

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

Business:

- Staff Update
- Council Appointments
 - Welcome new panelists:
 - David Cuan, SHPOA;
 - Mamie Angus, Resident;
 - Michael Leckie, AIBC.
- Requested Info:
 - 1998 Cedar Crescent; apologies for not sending approved changes for review by panel
 - Storm Water Management; this is managed by neighbourhoods independently
 - Boulevard maintenance, is done by Parks Board. There has been damage done. Protective barriers will be requested in future.

Project Updates:

3998 Granville Street	The Real Estate Board has been contacted about the misleading listing.
1281 Matthews Ave	There is a development permit for
1490 Balfour Ave	There is a minor amendment, it won't proceed to panel
1460 Matthews	Will proceed to panel shortly

Review of Minutes:

- February 4th, 2016 - minutes passed
 - Typo page 4: architecture changed from architectural
 - Important addition to page 5 of the notes, 2nd paragraph.
 - 3rd paragraph, 3rd sentence: change wording to an doors.
 - 6th paragraph: the large *horizontal* roof.
 - Page 3 at the bottom: the permeable area.
- March 9th, 2016 -minutes passed
 - Page 3. Item one. Is the panel supportive of?
 - Page 5. Aggregate is misspelled.
 - Page 5. The not there.
 - Page 6. 2nd sentence. Pretty should remove to 'to see'

The Panel considered two applications for presentation

Address: 1975 West 18th Avenue
 Description: New build on non-protected property
 Review: First
 Architect:
 Delegation:

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (10 in favor, 0 abstentions, 0 against)

Planning Comments:

This is a proposal for a new house on a Non-Protected Property.

This mid-block, relatively flat site, and fronts West 18th Avenue with a rear lane. The proposal includes a centrally located two and a half storey single family dwelling with a four car accessory building at the rear of the lot. The principal building is consistent limestone veneer cladding from base to eave. The application is in general conformance with the regulation outlined in the District Schedule.

Questions to Panel:

1. Commentary on proposed materials and expression as it relates to the tripartite composition and authenticity of materials outlined in the Design Guidelines.
2. General commentary on the proposed architectural and landscape design as it relates to the FS Design Guidelines.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The applicant introduced the project as being first in the new By-Law. The intent was grand expression with emphasis on landscape, not the automobile. The By-Law directed the expression. The front was a given an axial body with conformed side. There was a garden room attached to the side. It was given a symmetrical roof expression with two imbedded small domes. The roof expression motif for the garage intent was to give light in the garage. The back of the house, the north side, has a large covered porch. The house is for children, so there is a clear view from the living room into the back yard. height of the front hedge will be 4 feet. The trellis will likely be proposed to be uncovered. The windows are all planned to be wood. The proposed style is neo-Georgian. ?? The metal work across the balconies is wrought iron and the windows across the basement are ?. Stone should not be veneer according to Planning. The limestone will have a different colour. The split face proposed has a tri-partite expression. The roof proposed is slate.

The landscape was a lush setting around the house. There was layered planting and trees that created... The front yard had challenges because the neighbouring houses had stone retaining walls. The appearance was maintained with stone retaining walls. There was a wood retaining wall that encroached on to the boulevard. The pine trees in the front are proposed to be removed with the retaining wall, and instead create a first garden room. There are wide side yards, so garden rooms are on the side. There is a well maintained cedar hedge. ON the other side there is evergreen lush tree planting. There will be a sandbox for children.

The fencing material on the west side is wrought iron metal. The fence is shrouded but is necessary to stop animals. The trees in the east are snowbell trees. There is a planned planting on the lane of 3 feet. The trees are going to be maple.

Landscape:

This started out as a ?

Panel Commentary:

The panel thought that

-Mollie

The central siting and elegance was appreciated. There is a problem with the cupola on the roof and side metalwork and crests do not fit with the expression. It is a hodgepodge of style in the proposal.

Don:

The gardens are lush and well designed. The house is missing layering at the street. There is missing streetscape elements in the streetscape.

The lane is too exposed, so maybe something to soften it.

The dormer is not supported, it is too over the top.

The landscape is too formal.

John:

The symmetry is nicely broken up. Recommend moving the dormer to the east. A 3 car garage would be preferred. The dormers are too busy.

Frank:

The design is too busy. The 3 veranda railings are too showy. The medallions are not supported. The studio ?

Tim:

A panel member disagreed with the other members, and said the materials of the cupolas were appreciated. The building is well designed. The fireplace could be facing the patio. The kitchen doors are off center on the façade and could be pulled eastward. ON the north façade there is a dormer with a trim missing. There should be a cupola on the second floor. On the east elevation... There should be more 3 dimensionality on the north elevation. The garage is appreciated. The fence is not hanging together yet. The fireplace should be coming through the wall and expressed on the street. The garage should not be drywalled on the ceilings.

Michael:

The south elevation, is well balanced in the tri-partite and massing structure. The variety of architectural elements make the design overwrought. The ? is compatible with the sleight roof. The north elevation, main level is unresolved with the rest of the composition. The ancillary volume there is slight variation in the twin detail. The dormers on the garage function well to bring in light.

David

The project brings neighbourliness to the block. The tri partite expression comes from the different texture in the limestone. The separate garage of 4 is not an issue (one car less on the street). The sleight on the roof is appreciated as different. The veneer chimney treatment is good. The window is a classic look and supported with warmth of wood. No issue with removing the pines. The project is a good addition to Shaughnessy.

David

In agreement with colleauges.

Lu

Also agree another layer could be added to front tree landscape. The lane is too exposed, and more layers for privacy recommended.

Mimie

The good plans and model are appreciated. The only concern is the symmetry at the back, and it should be more congruous with the front.

Kathy

Tri partite expression is good with rough limestone at bottom. Good sleight on roof. The front needs more filigree.

Chair Summary:

Overall the design was impressive. There was mixed feelings about the cupola, some people felt it was too busy, but others who did not. There was comments about the missing filigree and layering in the front with more trees. There should be more softening of vegetation on the lane. The garden room at the side was a good feature. There were a few concerns about 3 cars instead of 4. There were concerns about the moldings, dormers and symmetry. There was concerns about the busyness of the features around the dormers and moldings.

Applicant's Response:

The applicant thanked the panel for their kind comments. Applicant wanted to express that this was a large house, with massing and height, and it was grand house with an expression that reflects it. The applicant felt they achieved with grandiosity of the new volumes of the new size. The detail and expression are a result of the new size. This is an opportunity to create a grand expression.

Suggestion to Planning staff that applicants have a material colour board presented by applicants going forward to clarify concerns for panelists in future.

Adjournment:

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 5:35 pm.