

FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: May 11, 2017
TIME: 4:00 pm
PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, Vancouver City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE FIRST SHAUGHNESSY DESIGN PANEL:

David Cuan	Chair, Resident, SHPOA
Richard Keate	Vancouver Heritage Commission
John Madden	Resident (present the first hour)
Mamie Angus	Resident
Tim Ankenmen	AIBC
Frank Shorrock	Resident, SHPOA
Lu Xu	BCSLA
Kathy Reichert	Resident
Pamela Lennox	Resident, SHPOA

CITY STAFF

Susan Chang	Development Planner
Ji-Taek Park	Development Planner
Tanis Knowles Yarnell	Heritage Planner
Bonnie Ma	Planner

LIASONS:

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

REGRETS:

Melissa de Genova	City Councillor
Mollie Massie	Vancouver Heritage Commission
Donna Chomichuk	BCSLA
Catherine Evans	Park Board Commissioner
Michael Leckie	AIBC
Robert Miranda	Vice chair, Resident
Joanne Giesbrecht	REBGV
Nicole Clement	Resident, SHPOA

RECORDING

SECRETARY: Camilla Lade

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 3789 Pine Crescent

Business Meeting

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

Business:

- Heritage Action Plan Update.

Project Updates and Review of Minutes:

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

The Panel considered one applications for presentation

Address:	3789 Pine Crescent
Description:	Conservation Proposal
Review:	First
Architect:	Loy Leyland Architect Inc.
Delegation:	

Planning Comments:

This application proposes additions to a protected two and a half storey 1912 variation on the “Craftsman” tradition house. Character defining elements identified include: Prominent, multiple roofs, irregular massing, non-symmetrical elevations, deep overhanging eaves with brackets, exposed structural elements, cedar shingle cladding, divided-light window assemblies, prominent front porch and granite column bases.

The dwelling has no lane. A three car garage is proposed, accessed from an existing crossing located on the south/east side of the lot. There is a significant Beech tree that has been identified for retention.

The proposal involves the relocation of the protected building on-site and with additions to the south and west.

Questions to Panel:

1. General commentary on the success of the architectural and landscape design proposals as they relate to the expectation of the FS Guidelines.
2. Is the addition visually compatible with, subordinate to, yet distinguishable from the existing building and in particular comments on preferred and optional proposal.
3. Consistency of architectural expression on all facades.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The existing house is in poor condition. Applicant is proposing to respect the original design by opening up the filled in porches, restoring the window trims and window divisions. The north and east facades will be retained and the building will be relocated while maintaining the front yard setback. The big issue is the proposed retention of a large beech tree in the rear yard. The basement will follow the perimeter of the critical root zone. The new addition will be setback from the front face of the original building but preference is to continue the existing ridge line. The other option is to drop the ridge lower which is not our preference as it limits ceiling height and a second fascia would be needed.

Landscape:

The existing cedar hedging on north and east perimeter will be retained. A distinctive pedestrian access will be separated with a boxwood hedge from the “country lane”/ curved driveway with a green median. The relocation of the house allows for two large trees in the front yard. Sunken patio is designed to be outside tree protection zone around the beech tree.

Panel Commentary:

- Maintaining the ridgeline for the new addition is supported. It keeps the roofline simple, is compatible and in keeping with First Shaughnessy. The addition is identifiable as a new wing. The original dark colour of the existing house should be explored with cream trim as a highlight per Craftsman house character. Rear arched windows should be dropped 2” at the side to achieve a “stilted” arch.
- Conservation proposal is appreciated, as this house would have been considered a tear down a few years ago. Preferred option is supported along with dark colour for the body of the house and light trim.
- Landscape planting, birch trees and retained hedges are appreciated. It is a good landscape proposal. The retaining the existing vehicular access is supported but the pedestrian access gate should be located to its north side.
- Conservation proposal is appreciated and supported. The preferred continuous roofline is supported. On the east elevation, the new addition has richer detail and design, which competes with the existing house. Consider relocating the shed dormer on the addition to the existing house in order to subordinate the addition and celebrate the existing building. Landscape plan is appreciated. The garage could be angled along the same axis as the house. Pedestrian access relocated on the other side of vehicular access may be less circuitous. The sunken patio, if pulled out and made wider, could be more symmetrical. Rear/West elevation, the bell windows do not seem consistent with the house. California style dormer up top is inconsistent with the house. It should have the same roof pitch as the neighbouring dormers as ceiling height does not appear to be an issue. The north elevation roofline will be closer to the neighbour and should be more broken up possibly with a shed dormer. Similarly the wall planes could be more articulated such as bay windows added. Structure under the deck could be located closer to the house to assist with tree retention with deck cantilevered.
- Conservation proposal and cedar shakes are appreciated. The massing should typically be within the new building envelope and not past regulations. The pedestrian access should be moved to be more inviting and less confusing with vehicular access. East elevation should be clear where the original entry doors are. Cedar shakes on the roof would be preferred as this is characteristic of Craftsman houses and due to the visibility of the roof.
- The proposal is a vast improvement on the existing house. The planting and garden design is beautiful. A majestic house is proposed compared to what is there now.
- It should be more reflective of the Craftsman building of 1912. There are five verandas and six pairs of doors that is too busy and do not reflect Arts and Crafts style. Doors windows casements and railings are also not characteristic of Arts and Crafts style. The landscaping is excellent.

Chair Summary:

The panel appreciates the efforts to preserve and improve on the existing home with new exterior wall finishes and the location of the proposed addition. We also support the option with the simple ridgeline. Overall landscape design and the proposed retention of the existing cedar hedge along the front property line were well-received.

The applicant should consider articulating the roof design of the proposed addition to make it subservient to the original house, using darker exterior colours to lessen the perceived mass of the house/addition, relocating the pedestrian access gate, repositioning the garage to match the axis of the house, relocating the posts supporting the wood deck further away from the existing beech tree and reviewing the architectural elements of the proposed addition for consistency to the Arts and crafts style of the existing house.

Applicant's Response:

The applicant thanked the panel for the comments.

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with comments addressed (7 in favor, 0 abstentions, 0 against)