

**FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES**

**DATE:** September 22, 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  
 Mollie Massie Vancouver Heritage Commission  
 Frank Shorrock SHPOA  
 David Nelson SHPOA  
 David Cuan SHPOA  
 Joanne Giesbrecht REBGV  
 Lu Xu BCSLA  
 Donna Chomichuk BCSLA  
 John Madden Resident  
 Mamie Angus Resident  
 Michael Leckie Architect

CITY STAFF:  
 Georgina Lyons Development Planner  
 Susan Chang Development Planner

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

**REGRETS:**  
 Tim Ankenmen Architect  
 Peter Kappel Vice-Chair, SHPOA

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Lidia McLeod Urban Design Coordinator

<b>ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING</b>	
1.	1638 Angus Drive
2.	1655 Angus Drive
3.	1227 W King Edward Avenue

**Business Meeting**

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

Business:

- Requested Info:
  - Review of rezoning and development permit process

Project Updates:

3743 Cypress Street	Application for landscape work so will not come to panel.
1037 West King (Kind) Edward Avenue	Rezoning approved by Council
1645 West King (Kind) Edward Avenue	Renovation of an existing house that will come to panel as a non -protected property.  <i>Note: at meeting application was incorrectly described as a new house.</i>

Review of Minutes:

- May 19<sup>th</sup>, 2016 - Passed

---

**The Panel considered three applications for presentation**

---

Address: 1638 Angus Drive  
 Description: Conservation - Protected Property  
 Review: First  
 Architect: Formwerks  
 Delegation: Jim Bussey, Claudia Koerner & Olive Luo

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8 in favor, 0 abstentions, 2 against)**

---

**Planning Comments**

This is an application for an addition to a Heritage building on a Protected Property.

The Brougham Residence is a two and half-storey British Arts and Crafts house which was constructed in 1910.

The architectural defining features are:

- Wood frame construction with granite-clad foundations
- British Arts and Crafts details, for example:
  - Nearly symmetrical front façade;
  - Stucco and half-timbered gables with shingle cladding at the peak;
  - Exposed rafter-tail;
  - Central entry way;
  - Etc.

This house is situated at the rear of a large mid-block site with no rear lane. Vehicular access is from two crossings off of Angus which lead to a large circular drive.

The existing location of the house precludes rear additions due to its proximity to the rear property line.

The proposal entails two flanking additions to the protected house. The additions are located in areas where previous work has been done. This allows for the least altered elevations, front and rear of the house, to remain exposed.

The existing house has attached parking which will remain, and the proposal includes the addition of an accessory building in a location that is currently paved.

### Questions to Panel

1. Staff are seeking commentary from the panel on how the proposal engages with the conservation principals outlined in the design guidelines;
2. Staff are seeking commentary from the panel regarding the relationship between the protected house and the two flanking additions.

### Applicant's Introductory Comments

The applicants noted that they are happy to be at the panel for review. A lot of controls have been created in order to re-vitalize First Shaughnessy and retain heritage.

Along Angus Drive there are two accesses which feed into the front driveway. The front yard is being kept and upgraded. In the 1980s some additions were made which are nice, but a bit apologetic and are no longer supportable. Under the new zoning a larger house is allowable in order to diminish in height and scale the prominence of the additions.

There are a tremendous number of large overgrown trees at the back which require some maintenance. The goal is to minimize the impact of the overgrowth without removing trees.

The house is divided into family zones and 'meeting' rooms. The basement has been redone, and the second floor consists entirely of bedrooms. There is also a small attic addition with an outdoor terrace to make it more livable as a space. The height of the main floor is being lowered by 1 ft. to create higher ceilings.

A cement pad (An outbuilding) already exists, and (but) a small charming garage (addition) is being proposed (as an addition).

### Landscape

This lot is 50,000 sq. ft., one of the biggest in First Shaughnessy. This is important as the landscape is effectively a park with large open spaces and mature trees. There are also pathways and a water feature already on the property which are being enhanced.

The layout is not being changed, just enhanced to create a more park-like feel. Pathways are being created under the trees to allow for more exploration. View corridors will be created down to a water feature which will both retain storm water and bring additional water up to the surface.

Trees will be used to hide the house massing and add layers. The current entrances are very dark and hidden, so they are being reinforced with stone walls and wrought iron gates.

From the front there are not many changes. An existing cedar hedge is being retained with some

modifications to create more of a layering effect. To the east mature trees are being kept with a pathway leading to the back. The back it is dominated by large cedar trees creating an enclosed effect. These will be pruned back a bit, but generally used for essential screening. To the west there will be a flagstone pathway which wraps around the house back to the front again.

A sunken patio at the back is being retained and revitalized with new masonry.

### **Panel Commentary**

The panel thanked the applicant but was split on whether the composition of the added elements worked well. Some members thought that there is too much massing on the side additions, and that it is not visually compatible or subordinate to the heritage portion.

The frontage of the house does not make the new addition feel subordinate enough to the existing heritage house. The front gates and stone walls are too heavy and create (add much) impenetrability. The new wood windows for the front façade should be the leaded glass style of the original windows and fit in the existing casings. The double front doors and sidelight windows should (need) to be replaced with a more thematically appropriate version(s). If the original main floor level is dropped one foot it is important that this is done carefully so as (needs to) not change the original façade, (ansd) T(t)he new porte-cochere needs to be redesigned in a scale which is sympathetic to the original house. One panelist thought that the large forecourt looked fine as its formality balances the large massing.

The proposed landscape does not feel like it follows the guidelines. Given the scale of the house there is not a lot of opportunity to add softscape to ground the house; limiting the paving may help to mitigate this. The side yard setbacks are too small, and additional exposure of the park-like yard to the streetscape is needed. (The panel generally supported)There could be reduced tree canopy coverage for the site.

The parking pad should not be seen from the street and a four-car garage at the front seems inappropriate to the Shaughnessy guidelines.. The two-car garage is also inappropriate, and should either be made more 'charming' or removed. Some panelists thought that the driveway looks a bit too formal.

The floating chimney on the south façade should have the brackets added back in or extend to grade in order to be respectful to the style of the house.

### **Chair Summary**

The chair thanked the applicant for their presentation and noted that some members felt the additions are a bit too overpowering and not respectful to the original heritage house. Others felt that the added addition works well sit the original siting. The front door should be larger with sidelights, and design development is needed on the porte-cochere to make it fit better with the proposal. There is concern that the two-car garage is unnecessary, and it should either be removed or changed to make it more charming. The driveway is a bit too formal, and the four-car garage is too visually obvious from the street and needs to be softened or changed . As well, the front gates seem too solid and should be mitigated with more visual penetration.

### **Applicant's Response**

The applicant team thanked the panel for their opinions. The parking can be softened, maybe with trellis work or additional planting, and more visual accesses will be added into the property. A look will also be taken at the formality of the forecourt and driveway, and the massing of the porte-cochere can be softened.

---

Address:	1655 Angus Drive
Description:	New Build - Non-Protected Property
Review:	First
Architect:	Formwerks
Delegation:	Jim Bussey, Claudia Koerner & Glen Williams

---

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

---

### Planning Comments

This is an application for an addition to a post-date house on a non-protected property.

The house is centrally located on this midblock site with no lane access. The building is proud on the site and is existing and non-confirming as it relates to the front and side yard. Existing parking is located in an attached garage to the west side of the house and is accessed by a circular drive.

The proposal entails the removal of the attached garage to allow a drive access to an accessory building to the north of the house, a one storey rear addition to the principal house and two accessory buildings; an electrical kiosk adjacent to the new drive and a pool house at the rear of the lot.

The street fronting elevation has been reworked, removing the original colonial elements.

### Questions to Panel

1. Does the form of development proposed successfully engage with the First Shaughnessy Guidelines as they relate to:
  - Tripartite expression;
  - External material quality and expression?
2. Does the landscape design adhere to the Landscape Principals in the Design Guidelines?

### Applicant's Introductory Comments

This is an existing house being renovated. The current house is in a Plantation style, and the goal is to make it a (bit more French) more grand and in s French Country style.

The pool is being moved to the other side to allow for more sunlight, the tennis court is being removed and a pavilion is being added along with a much greener back yard. Access to the backyard is provided with a set of stairs alongside the pool. The basement also has a new terrace.

A slate roof, zinc gutters and rocky mountain granite façade are proposed. However, it is unlikely that the slate roof will actually go forward.

### Landscape

Everything looks very flat and tired currently. The driveway at the front is being kept, but more softscaping is being introduced to make it less overpowering. The new wing-walls allow for more landscaping and softscaping.

The landscape curvature and trees help to give it more filigree at the front and play off the curvature of the driveway. The existing hedge is being kept but more layered planting is being added. Planters on the sides allow for privacy from the neighbours.

The backyard is all about entertaining and enjoying the outdoors. A pool lines up with a staircase and an infinity edge, which creates a nice transition with falling water. Taking out the tennis court allows for much more greenspace and layering.

### **Panel Commentary**

The panel generally liked the house and noted that pushing back the garage and removing it from the front of the house improves the front elevation of the house. The new look also dramatically improves the streetscape.

The railings are quite modern and the back looks a bit too Whistler-ish; these aspects are a bit out of character with the rest of the house. Going through with the slate roof would enhance the house.

The front landscaping does not meet the design guidelines and should be more pastoral to fit in with the neighbourhood. The guidelines intend enclosure, and more mid-level height shrubs could help to create this while maintaining a sense of openness. Currently the European style at the front is too formalized.

Consider how the distance of the garage from the entrances to the house will impact bringing groceries inside.

The ground-floor windows could be a bit more robust. As well, lights in the two cupolas and palladian windows should be more vertical. (the window pane cupolas should be narrower, and more verticality could be added to the windows overall). The capitals on the columns could also be simpler to make the house grander.

### **Chair Summary**

The chair noted that the panel is impressed and happy with moving the garage back, and that the front elevation is more in-line with the design guidelines. The slate roof would enhance the house, but overall the materials look nice. The front landscape should adhere (keep in) more with the design guidelines but it is nice to not have it fenced in.

### **Applicant's Response**

The applicant team thanked the panel for their good commentary despite this application not fitting in with the (canon??) of the guidelines.

?Was this the word used? Not sure what it means?

Address: 1227 W Kind Edward Avenue  
Description: New Build - Non-protected Property  
Review: First  
Architect: Formwerks  
Delegation: Jim Bussey, Claudia Koerner & Matt Mauza

---

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

---

### **Planning Comments**

This is an application for a new development on a non-protected property.

The site is a relatively flat, 100'x200' sq. ft., mid-block lot fronting onto W King Edward Avenue with a rear lane.

The proposal is a centrally located two and half storey single family dwelling with a four car accessory building located at the existing garage footprint. The existing circular driveway at W King Edward is being retained, with additional vehicular circulation at the side and rear yard.

### **Questions to Panel**

1. Can the panel offer commentary around the landscape proposal, specifically with regard to the raised vehicular manoeuvring at the East Side and Rear yard?
2. Can the panel comment on the success of the architectural and landscape design proposal as they relate to the expectations of the FS Guidelines?
3. Commentary on proposed materials and expression as it relates to tripartite composition and authenticity as outlined in the FS Guidelines?

### **Applicant's Introductory Comments**

The applicant team started by noting that this is a grand house in Shaughnessy and includes some additional height with a lot of embellishments.

A multi-access driveway and driving access is being proposed along the side of the house due to the advanced age of the intended residents. A 2ft. increase in grade in the side and the rear yard is also being requested to allow for easier access onto the site.

The front yard is meant to be a grand experience. The back looks out over the backyard to allow for supervision of children playing.

A one-storey element over the family room has a skylight to introduce light into the house. Some space exists in the attic to provide for an office in this space.

### **Landscape**

West King Edward Avenue is a busy street, so the gates have been recessed to allow sufficient space for a car to come in safely. There is a stone wall with columns at the front and a wrought iron fence on top. A yew hedge provides privacy for the client from the busy street.

Some yew trees give a concept of height to the front yard while still allowing the yard to be seen from the street. Existing hedges are being kept, including a cedar hedge along the driveway which provides screening. Maples are being added along the return driveway to create differentiation.

Douglas Firs at the back provide shading, while the rest of the backyard is open for the kids to play in.

### **Panel Commentary**

The panel thought that the house is a good addition to the streetscape, and that the embellishments on the house are great and add to the character.

Consideration should be given to reducing the apparent gymnastics of the driveway. However, the recessed gate looks fine and the double-access makes sense. Perhaps a drive-through garage could be explored.

There is a lot of pavement on the site which should be reduced.

Consider using a different material than asphalt for the roof.

The recessed gate is important for the entrance to the driveway and is safer.

### **Chair Summary**

The chair noted that the project was well-liked and will be an improvement to the streetscape. There is a lot of sympathy towards trying to take into account the disabilities of the residents, but there is general concern about the proposed vehicle access and the location of the garage. The roof material should not be asphalt if possible. The circular driveway is good for manoeuvrability. The lightwells are not very deep which may create issues in the winter. The recessed gates and the front landscape both look good. Many panel members were concerned that the need to abide by the city's tree bylaw removal was deemed more important than the disability issues of the new residents.

### **Applicant's Response**

The applicant team was very encouraged by the remarks of the panel. A drive-through garage will be considered on the other side of the site if the affected trees can be removed. Panel members commented that with the use of a drive through garage the side driveway may not be necessary.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:45 pm.