

## FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** September 14, 2017  
**TIME:** 4:00 pm  
**PLACE:** Town Hall Meeting Room, Vancouver City Hall

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE FIRST SHAUGHNESSY DESIGN PANEL:

Frank Shorrock	Resident, SHPOA
Kathy Reichert	Resident
Donna Chomichuk	BCSLA
Robert Miranda	Vice Chair, Resident
Michael Leckie	AIBC
Mamie Angus	Resident
Pamela Lennox	Resident, SHPOA
John Madden	Resident
Michael Kluckner	Vancouver Heritage Commission

**CITY STAFF**

Susan Chang	Development Planner
Ji-Taek Park	Development Planner

**LIAISONS:**

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

**REGRETS:**

Catherine Evans	Park Board Commissioner
Melissa De Genova	City Councillor
Lu Xu	BCSLA
Tim Ankenman	AIBC
Mollie Massie	Vancouver Heritage Commission
Joanne Giesbrecht	REBGV
David Cuan	Chair, Resident, SHPOA
Nicole Clement	Resident, SHPOA

**RECORDING**

**SECRETARY:** Camilla Lade

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 1080 Wolfe Ave

### Business Meeting

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

- **Minutes:**

- Approval of June 1<sup>st</sup> and June 22<sup>nd</sup> Minutes
- **Project updates:**
  - 1138 Richelieu Ave. Application received for a new house.
  - 1625 Matthews Ave., Application received for a new house.
  - 2003 W 19<sup>th</sup> Av.: Application received for a new house.
  - 2051 W. 19<sup>th</sup>: Minor Amendment to Pool House received and issued.

---

**The Panel considered one application for presentation**

---

Address:	1080 Wolfe Ave
Description:	Conservation Proposal
Review:	First
Architect:	J & R Katz Design & Architecture
Delegation:	Jonathan Katz, Architect
	David Rose, PD Group Landscape Architecture Ltd.

---

**Planning Comments:**

This conservation application proposes revisions and additions to an existing house built in 1912. The house is a 2 storey plus basement, located 1080 Wolfe Ave., on the South side of Wolfe Ave. at the top of Douglas Crescent. Existing 2 car garage and loft is located at the rear of the property.

The house is a Tudor revival style house, originally designed by Samuel Maclure.

Character defining elements of the existing house include:

- Prominently sited on upper plateau of a hill;
- Original Tudor revival house with symmetrical elevations;
- Large 4 gabled roof with prominent overhangs, exposed soffits, and substantial knee brackets.
- Off-centred recessed front entry porch;
- Stone foundation and granite stone base, including original granite retaining wall at front of property;
- Shingled ground floor with stuccoed and half-timbered second floor;
- Original window locations;
- Serpentine driveway to the 2 car garage at the rear of site.

The proposal includes the existing principal building to be relocated closer to the Wolfe Ave., and the 2 car garage to be relocated from the rear of the site to the lower plateau. The garage is proposed to be restored (with a small addition) and repurposed as a pool house, with a new pool at the base of the existing granite retaining wall. These relocations of the buildings provide more space at the rear of the property to enable a new addition. A direct access from the basement of the principal building to the lower plateau and the new pool is also proposed, via new openings in the existing granite retaining wall. The new addition is proposed as a simple contemporary style, connected to the principal building by a 'bridge' element at second level, ensuring retention of the original 4 gabled roof form. New parking is proposed under the principal building, along with new basement. The serpentine driveway will terminate at the garage overhead door, and thus reducing the amount of hard surface, and convert into green space. Existing access from Wolfe Ave. is being retained for the vehicle access and a new pedestrian walkway, with new wrought iron gates. The pedestrian walkway is proposed on top of existing retaining wall, with glass guardrails.

**Questions to Panel:**

1. Does the panel support the proposed relocation of the principal and accessory building?
2. Please comment on the success of the architectural and landscape design proposals as they relate to the expectations of the FS Guidelines.
3. Is the addition and proposed revisions visually compatible with, subordinate to, yet distinguishable from the existing building?

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The applicant noted the site plan shows the existing house (in the southwest corner) with a winding driveway around the house to the asphalt courtyard and garage (at the rear). It is a difficult site as it is fairly steep. The front yard is elevated with a low stone retaining wall, and another stone wall/plateau mid way through the depth of the site. The property at the rear is further elevated. Retaining the existing house in its current location was first explored, however the resulting side addition was problematic as it competed with the existing house. Also an addition to the house was a challenging due to the roof form. By pulling the house forward (closer to the plateau), it would be more prominent from Wolfe. It would also allow a rear addition that is subordinate to the grand residence. The addition was designed in a simple contemporary style as a background building.

The existing retaining walls will be retained. The existing two-car garage has been moved and re-purposed as a pool house. There is an opening in the stone wall to access to the recreation room.

**Landscape:**

Existing street trees and stone walls will be retained. There is a Yew hedge above the front retaining walls so that the site is fully screened from the street. The landscaping on the model is loosely described, as there are a lot of mature rhododendrons at the site. Views into the site are fairly limited. The frontage is private, especially at the pool house location. The garage at basement level allows driveway to be lower and screened behind stone retaining wall. A number of existing plants will be retained and relocated. Significant hedges off site are not shown on the model. Only 4 trees are removed out of 23 trees.

The applicant took questions from the panel.

**Panel****Commentary:**

- It is a challenging site and heritage value of this property is undeniable. It is appreciated the great length the design has gone through to retain and honor this house. Shifting the house on the site (although potentially problematic in many ways as the siting is related to the heritage aspect), is not overly compromising the relationship to the house to the context. There are a small number of possible scenarios on how to develop this site. The interface between the old and substantial addition in terms of the building separation and interface is less successful. The two buildings are competing because of their close proximity to one another and primary view line due to driveway presents a real challenge. The materiality and volumetric expression of the addition is problematic in relation to the existing house. The addition is not subordinate enough in relation to the other house. The colour needs consideration as proposed light colour jumps forward. The proportion of scaling and massing as well as fenestration in new addition needs consideration and a more desirable relationship. A large amount of area

- added on to the site requires more work to make the project supportable.
- I agree with all of the previous comments. The existing landscape is an old style and is a beautifully landscaped property. The granite walls are integrated with the planting and property. The relocation of the building is supported. The addition is distinguishable but not visually compatible or subordinate to the original building. The roofline, particularly the sunroof is too prominent. The pool location and sundecks facing north are 'surprising'.
  - Building upon the two previous comments, this is a challenging site and program may be unachievable. It is an awkward juxtaposition of two buildings in particular the rear gable so close to the addition. The relationship of the house to the ground plane does not meet the estate quality of the house in the landscape. The house located at the edge of the plateau disconnects it from the ground plane. The entry sequence climbing a narrow set of stairs with the front door on the edge of the plateau is not in keeping with First Shaughnessy. The north side of the house is too close to the driveway. The house moved forward is reluctantly supported, but the house should not be as prominent. The flat roof modernist design is acceptable but the windows on the addition are larger than the heritage house, which is visually challenging. The top storey of the addition should be reconsidered as it detracts from the gable roof forms. The landscape is chopped up and not connected. The driveway seems like a resort like hardscape.
  - It is a very difficult site and amount of work and effort is appreciated. Moving the house forward may be necessary due to the addition. It is unfortunate the addition is so large. It would be better if the house was moved less forward. The front door is a bit lost as driveway and car access is more prominent. There could be stairs from the front door to give it prominence, as it is hidden behind railings. The addition should be a darker colour. The glass railings should be revised to be in keeping with the heritage house. The yards are not connected and not easily accessible. Yards are only accessible through the house
  - It is inappropriate to move a Maclure house. The siting was chosen for a reason. It is special to First Shaughnessy to create the estate character and the relationship of house and garden. However, it is a challenging site, and the proposal is not there yet. The additions such as the swimming pool overwhelm the house. It has lost the 'estate like character'. There could be some curves in the front lawn, in Shaughnessy style. The scale is too much and FSR should be earned. The fenestration is not quite right. The back elevation and bridge idea needs more work. The new and old should not be aligned on the south side. The grandness of the approach to the front of the house has been lost. Remove the swimming pool, pool house and return front yard to garden. Respect the site and house. It is too busy and main house is being lost. The glass railings should be revised or limit access to avoid railings.
  - The intersection of the new and old is troubling. The new is not subordinate enough. The gate cut into the granite wall is 'distracting', and the 'inhuman' way the building is approached by foot is troubling. The pool in the front yard is not 'estate like'. Moving a Sam Maclure house is troubling. Maclure houses reflect Shaughnessy. A simple, elegant structure should be built beside it as an addition.
  - The challenge for this project is compatibility. The glass rail would be more in keeping with stone lintels on the top. The pool and cabana should be on the south side of the property. The 'shoe does not fit' in this design. The new addition is too prominent.
  - To balance heritage aspect and the client's needs is the challenge. The client has asked for too much extra space. The square footage has to be reduced. It is a lovely house and worth preserving. Moving the house is not a problem and an

addition is not possible without a move. Maclure's clients obviously wanted a smaller house. The two buildings are too close together. It should be either attached or more separate. Perhaps cut down the length of the addition but definitely behind, and put the swimming pool on the side. The front garden would look nicer in grass.

**Chair Summary:**

The FSR is conditional and proposed FSR is more than is appropriate for this project. The proposed addition is too large and should be less overpowering on the site. Some panel members would prefer the house sited further setback from the edge of the plateau. Others feel strongly the house should not be moved. The addition is too close to the main house. The proposal in the details, is overwhelming and not compatible with the existing house. The pool building and pool is in the wrong location. The yards are not connected and not easily accessible. Yards are only accessible through the house.

**Applicant's Response:**

The applicant thanked the panel for the comments. The applicant worked very closely with Planning on the proposal. Moving the house is important to accommodate the client's needs and requirements. The massing of the addition could be reduced. The pool house placement could be difficult.

**EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT ( 0 in favour, 0 abstentions, 8 against)**