

First Shaughnessy Design Panel

**MINUTES from the meeting of Oct 08, 2009, 4:00 pm
(Amended per FSADP Meeting, October 29,2009)**

Present: Lori Kozub Acting Chair and Resident
Mamie Angus Resident – SHPOA
David Cuan Resident SHPOA
Erika Gardner Resident - SHPOA
Victor Pillar Resident Member at Large
Clinton Cuddington Resident Member at Large
Wilfred Ng Resident Member at Large
Judith Hansen Heritage Commission
Loy Leyland AIBC
Lu Tang AIBC
Paul Sangha BCSLA
Michelle McMaster BCSLA
Lisa Macintosh REBGV
Ann McLean Development Planner, City of Vancouver

Regrets: Phil Yacht Resident Member at Large

Recording Secretary: Lu Tang

Staff Contact: Ann McLean, Development Planner, 604-873-7387

AGENDA

- Business:
1. Enquiry: Review of Site Visit and Discussion on retaining or demolishing the residence house on 1351 Laurier Ave.
 2. DE 413243 Application for a new house construction on 1917 Hosmer Ave.
 3. Recent Projects Update
 4. Election of new Chair and Vice Chair

New Business: There is no new business to report for this period

4:00 Panel site visit to 1351 Laurier Avenue as per request of Loy Leyland Architect

4:45 Business

1. Discussion of the existing house on 1351 Laurier Ave, as Director of Planning is seeking the opinion of the panel members on whether this building is meritorious of retention.

Address: 1351 Laurier Ave.
Inquirer: Loy Leyland Architect
Description: To consider demolition or retention of the residence
Application status: Enquiry
Review: First

Architect/Loy Leyland:

Discussions on Retaining or demolishing of the existing house built prior to 1940. Based on Shaughnessy Design Guidelines, any building constructed prior to 1914, though not of heritage status, would be reviewed for its merit if any. This house has some Prairie Architecture Style, especially the arches, and does have a many renovations outside and inside throughout the years. There is some character on exterior of the building. . The client's intention is to tear down the current structure and build a new Tudor type of style home.

Questions/Comments:

- Not objected to be taken down, house is huge.
- Would like to see sensitive restoration
- Somewhere in between... really curious about what the building originally look like? If possible, can the architect find the original photo of the house?
- No objection in bring it down
- Like to see it be kept
- House looks like in a removal state... there is however good bonus points, such as the Prairie style architecture, which is a rarity in Shaughnessy... Perhaps, we should at least see what was there before, by searching original photos if any from achieves, etc.
- It is comprised... restoration of what style, appears small, arches are low, nested into the property. A bigger house might feel more massive.
- Curious on how architect might advice on how to keep or build around the style of heritage house should be kept. Sitting on the fence.
- Wants to see the house been kept and to have a heritage summary. Perhaps some design sketches to see what can be done...
- Not a heritage A or B status... some evaluations seemed necessary; there is reference of keeping it or not. The question to ask is "Does it have heritage merit"?
- In principle, anything of value would like to see to be kept, thought this house does not have much character. Perhaps a retention study can be done

Summary: 3 no, 3 yes, and 3 undecided we should look into some heritage values and go from there.

MOTION: "Architect to access the heritage merit(s), and report back to the Design Panel for further consideration and decision."

- Seconded by Clinton,
- Carried. All in favour.

2. Review of the application for a new house construction on 1917 Hosmer Ave.

Address: 1917 Hosmer Ave.
Inquirer: Jim Bussey / Formwerks Architectural
Description: New House Design
Application status: Development Permit Application
Review: Second

Architect Jim Bussey presented the highlights of the proposed new house:

- This house can be seen from the corner, high visibility,
- Over all stone massing,
- Two large street trees to be preserved, for a number of good reasons, Roofing material will be zinc.
- To meditate the difference of the height, garden wall was created. For transition of the height from this building to the next seemed somewhat flat.
- Last time there is a lot of discussion on the entrance of the house, overly complex, on the matter of the winding walk, we have simplified the entrance.
- No large garage doors from the entry point of view, with two car garages.

Landscape Architect Feng Liu:

- 3 trees retained, one existing cheery tree will be retained, skyline canopy will not be changed,
- There will be wrought iron fence, cross wood hedges, layered landscape, some small trees, shrubs and ground covers, and water feature at front entrance. Branches of tress shapes the house well,
- Concrete pavers, with concrete bands.
- East side will form a screen, with proposed hedges and ground covers. On neighbouring west sides, there are stepping stone and steps from west and
- From the back, small cherry tree to be retained, Cedar hedge will form a very private yard; add interest to the back yard.
- The main feature of the back yard is the open and green large space.
- Fence is a modern design, complimenting architecture

Questions and Architect/Landscape Architect's Answers (amended):

Questions:

Is there a planting schedule?

Answers:

Yes, there is a planting schedule and they are irrigated.

Questions:

How many cars can the garage store?

Answers:

The garage is designed to park for two cars.

Questions:

Height issue... it is too high from back about 45'. Can the Architect explain about that? Also why 1300 sf for parking for two cars? Was this done because the FSR are not counted? Though we understand there is a desire for parking under basement in large homes.

Answers:

Yes, the height is about 45' from the back.

There are some mechanical space needed, in lieu or having it unfurnished, we just thought it would

be nice to have it finished from start.

Questions:

Could you please clarify the front setback? Looks like you are about 5'-6" projected into the required front yard setback... are you essentially asking for relaxation? Also the sloping percentage for drive way seemed less than the parking bylaw standard, particularly the first and last 20 feet?

Answers:

I did not realize that there is not sufficient setback at the front. It would be resolved with Planning Department should they allow as another request for relaxation? Drive way, yes, we understand your comments, will review the parking bylaw and with engineering.

Questions:

How do you define "modern design" for the fence?

Answers:

Modern design being simpler in form and is open ended at the top

Questions:

Material: Stone, stone caps, top gable, stone element? Metal roof, zinc, colour constant of dark mocha, window covers etc?

Answers:

Material finishes will be stone and from base to top of chimney on east side. Yes, metal roof.

Questions:

Flower boxes were added from last review?

Answers:

Yes, flower boxed were added to address the comments from last meeting

Questions:

Some refinement to garage entry... Use of the permeable material... And it is looking great, and handsome. Did not hear about the relaxation before for the porch?

Answers:

Thanks. We will need to review with planning department on the front sent back issue.

(End of Amendment)

Planning's Comments for Panel Consideration

Planning Staff Ann indicated that The First Shaughnessy Official Development Plan stated "To promote conservation and restoration of meritorious pre -1940 homes and maintenance of the estate-like image of development in accordance with design guidelines adopted by Council." Any building built prior to 1940 should be reviewed for historic merits or heritage value if any. And the Director of planning is seeking advice from the panel members for such merit(s).

Comments:

- Curious about the roof? Roofing material not sure, slate might be an alternative 1, no problem with the side yard or lantern style roof for relaxation. Stone needs to be the same all the way around the house? Garden looks OK... Fence seemed too high. Front setback relaxation perhaps needs to let the Director of Planning to decide.
- Too close to the front street, if it is pushed back, maybe better... North elevation, in thin wall to left hand side treated in stone, should that be wood paneling? Similar to the east side, as shown to be stone face.
- Northeast corner... backing out of garage space, additional pull-out space, not easy to get out... Style of the house fights with the iron-gate, etc.
- Front setback should be resolved with planning department and together with the issues of the drive way scoping percentage and turning at bottom. Fencing style would be nice to echo the architecture.

- Front yard should be pushed back... stone and based expression should be one pattern but not both. The roof possibly could be something else... nice house, with solidity, fence material can be wood or wrought iron. Recommending Arborist to be involved.
- Like the house design very much. Would probably say NO with relaxation, good design.
- Big improvement from last presentation.
- Like the house design... Not sure on how easy it is for the turning radius...
- Nice proposal for this lot, not so easy to do... not important to fit into the sight line... need more thought to the fence... whether it does enhance the building or not. Thanked the Architect for designing the house under the FSR. In support of the lantern roof design, the height relaxation is OK. The covered porch, for the style of our time is a great movement forward. Stone is nice around chimney. Perhaps in looking at it closely, there should be some breathing room between the design elements.
- Soft fencing perhaps can be considered? In lieu of fence, or perhaps no fence at all... Together with water feature would be nice. Applicant needs to deal with the fence design... perhaps more open, give more power to the architecture. Same stone pattern, deck at back, privacy issues, follow the consistence issue, lantern OK, side relaxation OK. Front set back maybe debated form the neighbourhood point of view.

Planning's Comments for Panel Consideration

Planning Staff Ann indicated that the front set back is an issue, ruled by the Director of Planning. In some areas of single family zone in Vancouver, you can project the porch into the front setback, but not in First Shaughnessy.

Chair Summary

- Thank you for the overall nice design/presentation.
- Positives of the Application
 - Design
 - Fine with the relaxation of the roof "lantern" and side yard
- Areas to be improved for final design
 - Front setback relaxation not supported
 - Style of the front gate – ironwork needs to blend in more with the home setting
 - Stone pattern should be the same throughout the home
 - More thought regarding the upstairs back deck regards to final design and privacy

MOTION: to approve the design application with comments addressed.

- Seconded and,
- All in favour. Carried.

3. Recent Projects Update:

- Ann advised that there are lots of minor questions for projects inquires this month, but no formal enquiry or application submitted to Design Panel at this time.
- Minutes review of Aug 06, 2009:

- 1) It was decided to postpone the review and approval of the minute of Aug 06 until the next meeting, because some member have not read the minutes yet, and there is no print out at this meeting.
- 2) Councillor George Chow made an appearance and presented himself as council liaison person for FSADP.

4. Election of new Chair and Vice Chair:
- Lori Kozub was nominated and elected as the New Chair
 - David Cuan, David was elected as the Vice Chair

Meeting adjourned

~~~~~ END OF MINUTES ~~~~~