

FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: September 5, 2013

TIME: 4:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE FIRST SHAUGHNESSY DESIGN PANEL:
 Linda Collins Chair, Resident
 Dallas Brodie Vice-Chair, Resident, SHPOA
 Donna Chomichuk BCSLA
 Clinton Cuddington AIBC
 Erika Gardner Resident
 Peter Kappel Resident, SHPOA
 Michael Kluckner Vancouver Heritage
 Benjamin Ling AIBC
 Alastair Munro Resident, SHPOA
 Frank Shorrock Resident, SHPOA
 Jennifer Stamp BCSLA
 Kerri-Lee Watson Resident

CITY STAFF:
 Tim Potter Development Planner
 Colin King Development Planner

LIAISONS:
 George Affleck City Councillor

REGRETS: Lisa MacIntosh REBGV

RECORDING SECRETARY: Kerri-Lee Watson

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	1927 Hosmer Avenue
2.	1656 Laurier Avenue
3.	1189 Balfour Avenue

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Collins called the meeting to order at 4:10 pm and noted the presence of a quorum.

It was discussed that it is of great concern to the Panel to hear about the City's plan to rezone major arterial streets in the First Shaughnessy Heritage District. Councillor Affleck offered to gather more information on the City's rezoning policy and to report back to the Panel.

Clinton Cuddington gave a presentation on the creation of the First Shaughnessy Official Development Plan written in 1982 and its relation to the Design Guidelines which followed in 1991. The FSODP was written by Abraham J. Rogatnick, who received a Fullbright Scholarship, studied under Walter Gropius (founder of the Bauhaus), obtained a Master of Architecture from Harvard GSD and worked as a special advisor to the Canada Council and the City of Vancouver's Design Panel. AJR was a full professor at the UBC School of Architecture when he wrote the FSODP.

The Design Guidelines were written by Robert Lemon, MAIBC. From 1991 to 1996 Robert Lemon was the Senior Heritage Planner for the City of Vancouver. It was stated in Clinton's presentation that the intention of the Design Guidelines is not to become a stylistic manifesto mandating acceptable styles.

- This thought is noted in the Design Guidelines on page 11: "the guidelines do not require new housing design to replicate the older character housing existing in Shaughnessy."

Recent Project Updates:

Presented by Tim Potter

3990 Marguerite	SOS appearing at the Commission on September 16th
3809 Osler	Demolition enquiry, SOS received August 21st
1998 Cedar Crescent	Demolition enquiry, SOS received July 19th
4033 Osler Street	Demolition enquiry, SOS received August 21st

The last three items on the list require a Statement Of Significance and will be reviewed by the Heritage Commission as well.

The Panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation:

1. Address: **1927 Hosmer Street**
 Description: Application for preservation/renovation of a post-date house
 Review: Second
 Architect: Nexus Construction
 Delegation: Nexus Construction: Daryl Martini, Katherine Gordon, Jab Figueroa

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8 in favor, 1 against)

- **Introduction:** Tim Potter introduced the project and explained that there is a stop work order on the property because the walls were removed and most of the structure was no longer standing.

It was noted that the applicants are not requesting any major changes to the originally issued permit, they want to rebuild the same structure presented at the last review.

- **Planning Comments:** The Panel reviewed this proposal on February 07, 2013. The Panel was in support of the application subject to some concerns regarding the streetscape and how the proposal would fit in with older homes; there were landscape concerns regarding the appearance of fortification of the dwelling. The applicant seeks the approval to revise the amount of retained existing structure.

Advice from the Panel is sought on the following:

- Has the overall quality of the proposal been maintained through this proposal?
 - In view of the nature of this amendment, are there other possibilities to improve the project as it may relate to proportions of openings and/or other elements of the proposal?
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** Katherine Gordon explained that Nexus intended to maintain this house but ran into the following issues: asbestos in the walls, dry rot and lead paint. Nexus met with both a company dealing with hazardous materials and the building inspector. It was finally decided the best way forward was to tear down and rebuild the walls. There was no malicious intent with the removal of the walls.
- **Related Commentary from the Panel:**
Things can go wrong in projects, however the applicant should have responded to the permits as issued, rather than eradicating the walls to remove the problem.

Although the applicant acted non-maliciously, by removing the walls the applicant loses the privilege of renovation. By removing the walls the applicant has changed the position from conservation to demolition and now should be applying for a permit for new construction.

The Panel does not want the precedent set for tearing down a house when a problem arises.

In response to a comment about the footprint of the house exceeding the side yard setbacks it was noted that the low height of the house (one story) means there would be little effect on the side neighbours.

With respect to landscaping it was noted the ODP calls for a more developed and layered landscape plan and that the design of the front gate might be improved with more of a horizontal expression.

- **Summary:**

The applicant's original intent was to preserve and renovate this post-date house. The panel was supportive of this approach and approved this preservation/renovation at the last review.

Because the house will be re-built as originally approved the Panel is in support of this project with the caveat that we do not want to see this process of eradicating the building used as a precedent.

2. Address: **1656 Laurier Avenue**
 Description: Application for the renovation of a pre-1940's house
 Review: Third
 Architect: Jim Bussey
 Delegation: Jim Bussey, Ron Rule Consultants Inc.
-

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (10 in favor, 0 against)

- **Planning Comments:** The Panel reviewed this proposal on April 11, 2013. The proposal is a renovation to an existing pre-date house. Key elements on the front elevation such as existing windows and related motif and detailing were to be retained.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

- Please comment in general and in particular on the success of the proposal as it relates to the FSODP and Guidelines.
 - Please comment on the success of the revised proposed north elevation as it relates to overall design and retention.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** This is a grand Shaughnessy house with a Bel Air aspect. The house calls for preservation and enhancement of many charming architectural details.

- **Related Commentary from the Panel:**

There was very positive feedback on the retention and renovation of this pre-1940's house. The house and landscaping surrounding it are in keeping with the FSODP and Guidelines.

There was particular support for the retention of the streetscape by maintaining the original front gardens and setback. It was noted and commended that the architect revised his original plans in order to preserve the root system of the neighbors gigantic sequoia tree.

The applicant jumps through hoops to create a meritorious project and succeeds. The house has great stature and should be commended on all levels. The house has been raised in the center to mitigate low interior ceilings, the increased building height is within that allowed in First Shaughnessy.

There were concerns expressed about the design of the accordion doors at the rear of the house, and the skylight over the porte-cochere.

- **Summary:**

Unanimous support for this application as it retains and refurbishes a grand Shaughnessy house. This meritorious project fits the FSODP and the Guidelines and greatly adds to the character and charm of the First Shaughnessy neighborhood.

3. Address: **1189 Balfour Avenue**
Description: Application for a new arts and crafts style house
Review: Second
Architect: Loy Leyland
Delegation: Loy Leyland, Julie Hicks
-

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7 in favor, 2 abstentions)

- **Planning Comments:** The Panel reviewed this proposal as an enquiry on March 21, 2013. The Panel was in support of an application proceeding subject to concerns regarding the expression of the elevations, particularly south and west, the lack of connectivity between the rear of the house and the garden, particularly with regard to the sunken patio and the landscape design in terms of increasing layering and grouping of trees.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following: Have the revisions adequately addressed the Panel's previous comments?

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** This is a contemporary arts and crafts house, the house and landscaping both fit well into the neighbourhood.

- **Related Commentary from the Panel:**

Positive reviews in terms of landscape and garden setting with its layering and gentle densification. The landscape issues have been addressed by increasing planting, the garden paths have increased the connection with the street.

The roof material specified is thicker asphalt shingles. It was noted that slate or another higher quality material would be more in keeping with the Design Guidelines.

It is false economy not to have the architect involved in the project during the construction; the best use of the client's money is to retain the architect through construction.

There was issue with the facade of the building being too busy, specifically with the medallion details on the posts and the panels between the windows.

Massing - the enormous volume of house is not reflected in the floor space due to the open second story. This open interior space makes the house appear much larger on the property and along the streetscape. The panel is not in favor of this technique to increase the volume of the house.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:30 pm