

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

MINUTES from the Meeting of Jan 21, 2010, 4:00 pm

Present:	Lori Kozub	Chair SHPOA
	David Cuan	Resident SHPOA
	Erika Gardner	Resident SHPOA
	Victor Piller	Resident SHPOA
	Clinton Cuddington	Resident Member at Large
	Phil Yacht	Resident Member at Large
	Mamie Angus	Resident Member at Large
	Wilfred Ng	Resident Member at Large
	Lu Tang	AIBC
	Paul Sangha	BCSLA
	Michelle McMaster	BCSLA
	Judith Hansen	Heritage Commission
	Lisa Macintosh	REBGV
	Ann McLean	Development Planner, City of
	Vancouver	
Regrets:	George Chow	City Council
	Loy Leyland (abstain)	AIBC
Recording Secretary:	Lu Tang	
Staff Contact:	Ann McLean, Development Planner, 604-873-7387	

AGENDA

Business:

1. Review of Minutes of Dec 10, 2009
2. Recent Projects Update
3. Presentation: "How FSD Permits are Processed" by John Greer, Processing Centre Manager

New Business:

1. 1052 Wolfe Ave.
Enquirer: Loy Leyland Architect
Description: To consider the proposed design of a new single family house on the vacant Lot.
Review: Enquiry (First)
2. 1288 The Crescent
Enquirer: Loy Leyland Architect
Description: To consider the proposed design of a new single family house and retention and relocation of existing pre-1940's home.
Review: Enquiry (First)

MEETING

4:00 PM Business:

1. Review of Minutes

Amendments to minutes regarding 1527 King Edward:

Add to comments: "Existing house not of architectural merit."

2. Recent Projects Update

There are no new applications received and no updates. Enquires continue.

3. Presentation "How FSD Permits are Processed" by John Greer, Processing Centre Manager, was postponed. Needs to be rescheduled.

Scheduled Dates for 2010 meetings on Feb 11 and March 4 are cancelled due to Olympics.

New Business:

1. 1052 Wolfe Ave.

Enquirer: Loy Leyland Architect

Description: To consider the proposed design of a new single family house on the vacant Lot.

Review: Enquiry (First)

Presented by Architect Loy Leyland:

- This is a vacant site, and is the result of subdivision of a larger site into two lots.
- Issue regarding the location of the house, whether to set it further front or set back
- A bit challenging as to what orientation to take
- Neighbors want the location to be front
- Could require a relaxation for rear set back.
- Drive way almost finished and there is retaining wall built
- House plan is similar to the one built next door, but not a copy.
- House sits as low to the ground as possible and we had to have a split level main floor to achieve this as well as the grade average prescribed by zoning.
- Georgian style, regular shape, materials are traditional, stucco, split faced granite
- Textured rough stucco, gutters can be better material; there will be substantial wood detailing.
- It is all open to discussion at this early stage.

Questions:

Q: Grades? Please talk about it ... up about 5' difference... house is in the middle?

A: It is as low as it can be.

Q: Are you excluding all garages from FSR?

A: Yes. Not all of the space has living space above it. In order to get the house in the setback area, the parking now extends under the deck area

Q: Did Planning and the architect talked about the parking issue yet?

A: No, not so far. To be excluded, it has to be totally under the living area.

Q: Does that make a difference to the client?

A: We could possibly do something about it.

Q: Why four cars?

A: 3 maybe OK, just a way to fill in the unused crawl space.

Q: Are you under the FSR?

A: No, we are at the max.

Q: Did neighbours write letters to support the house being pushed forward?

A: Yes. It is Planning's opinion that the house should be pushed back.

Q: Do all setbacks meet the requirements?

A: Walls are within; however the roof is projecting into side yards.

Q: Are the colour schemes done? Will the panel be looking at the colour presentation?

A: Yes.

Q: Will the owners see this house from Osler? From the back?

A: Yes, moving it back will put the house more into the view of the house at the back.

The actual max height is 35' approximately. If pushed back, the house to be higher than maximum allowed.

Q: What are the exterior finishes?

A: One of them is exposed concrete... and the driveway wall will be with granite.

Q: Can you please talk more about the driveway?

A: All entry comes from one point which better than next door. There will be pedestrian gate.

Q: Is this a spec house?

A: Yes.

Q: Where is the fire hydrant location?

A: There was some relocation and engineering dept has confirmed that they will support this location of the driveway.

Q: What is the height of the crawl space?

A: Is 3'-11"

Q: A couple of trees are recommended to keep? No 7 and 8, where is the chestnut on the plan?

A: The one with the dotted lines can't stay, because the drive way is there and need clearance.

Q: Landscape person is not here?

A: Can't answer the landscape questions

Mr. Leyland states that the front yard setback is 6', practically the higher ground setting, neighbour's letter has been submitted (3) in support of the location of house sitting... please comment.

Q: Please clarify why set house forward will be a good decision?

A: Otherwise, the landscaping and house will be above the tree top. With the way this stone wall

and the site raises there was concerns that the location of this house could project into others views.

Planning Comments and Questions to Panel:

With respect to the statement in Mr. Leyland's Design Rationale regarding the front yard setback, we would like to clarify that Planning recommended the house be set back an additional 4 to 6 ft from the front yard setback required in the ODP. This is in consideration to the particular topography of this site, the location of adjacent homes, and the development of a streetscape in keeping with the FSD ODP and Guidelines. Letters from three adjacent neighbours have been provided stating support for the location currently proposed by Mr. Leyland. The Planning department will consider these with consideration with the objectives of the ODP and Guidelines, as well as with comments from this Panel.

The Director of Planning seeks your comments on this proposal with regard to the intent and principles of the FSD ODP and Guidelines, and with particular regard to the siting of the building in consideration of the particular topography, shape and adjacencies of this site.

Comments:

- Concerned with four car spaces, and it is not counted as FSR.
- Look at the living room to reduce space
- Because the space curved out and it is not as a built structure... most houses will have restrictions. You can comply 4-5' setback, without the patio sticking out.
- This design looks like a spec. house to me.
- The location of the house, back or forward, suggest perhaps somewhere half way in between maybe a comprise.
- Whatever it is going to be built it will feel dominant. As long as the landscaping is properly addressed, it is OK to have the house set a bit forward. I do think the house needs to be acknowledged and parking need to be counted in as FSR unless you can design right under the living space.
- I do not like the pedestrian walk coming right at the landing of the driveway. How visible it is to the public? And how that flight of stairs and 5-6' of straight run up will end at the ... Entry rotunda... not so sure about the design.
- Garage needs to be reworked
- Setback is fine
- Somehow these comments belong here, if we have been given time to look at the site before the meeting will be nice... And the fence is keeping people out.
- Perhaps the owner can be there for one hour to meet and discuss. Some sites are easier than others to see and to understand.
- In favour to be front
- Design needs to be more solid
- Need to clarify how much FSR is exempt for parking, precedent will be set if we approve this layout.
- To have an estate like quality and better streetscape, I believe further set back will be nice.
- Keeping it forward and it will break up the unit and variation, lacked southern elevation treatment, maybe demanding a great level of resolution. Mirroring the other street entrance from the driveway. Need to solidify the entry. Perhaps look at the house for a better "handshake" with the ground level and some staircase at the sub-terracing level is not quite resolved
- Front entrance should be staggered, shift driveway

- Landscape needs a lot of resolution
- In terms of garage, feels there is potential that taking the four cars out, doing something different with it coming straight in, or have the cars split on both sides of the house.
- Setback is correct, of all the reasons as mentioned, setting it back further would make the house squashed
- Landscaping needs significant amount of layering and increasing the amount of landscape and soften the views of house and noisy barrier. In terms of moving the front door to front, view is not so predominate. The flow, from the rear property can be properly laid out. And landscape is where this submission needs work the most.
- Soften landscaping, maybe add flower boxes to front and south elevation... and add some void space such as veranda or open patio along south which may tie the building better and make the vehicle entry better suited.
- One can also take advantage in this case for the higher sitting by creating interesting landscaping elements such as water fall etc, not only it beautify the design, it also help mitigate the noise issue.
- I don't feel like there would be a great deal of enjoyment in living in this house. This plan is just about maximizing the floor area. It should create a nice space to live. There is no estate feel to this home. Consider the neighbours as they have an investment into this area.
- Box like design
- There should be more concern and consideration into this plan.
- You are about 400 sf over and you will be cutting the area off, maybe it is a choice at the back and shortening the house a little bit.
- Consider a smaller footprint to improve the quality of the overall project

Chair's Summary:

Majority think the setback should be closer to the front than the back
 The garage FSR issue needs to be addressed
 Design needs to be reconsidered
 Landscaping issues and how it is integrated together, etc.

Motion: To come back for a second Enquiry with the above comments addressed.

- Seconded and,
- All in favour. Carried.

2. 1288 The Crescent

Enquirer: Loy Leyland Architect

Description: To consider the proposed design of a new single family house and retention and relocation of existing pre-1940's home.

Review: Enquiry (First)

Presented by Architect Loy Leyland:

There is no landscape architect yet on this project.

- Estate like and large trees
- In discussion with Planning before, future of retaining trees to the large trees on west side.
- There was another application before, but did not go ahead. Building has been vacant for a long time

- There are complaints from the neighborhood about its current status.
- Previously not deemed to have a lot of architecture merit.
- Propose the new house is about 18,300 sf, including the retention of a portion of the existing house. The site is about 40,844 sf.
- This is a mid block site, and with a slope of about 6' from front to back, and the main ridge is at 35'.
- The existing house would be reposition in the back with a two car garage and a hobby/caretaker suite above. There are two options presented for this form to be either attached or detached.
- The materials will be high quality, indigenous and typical of this heritage area, the client is committed to do his best for this large estate.

Questions and Answers:

Q: Existing house to be retained or to be moved into a higher podium? Or is the garage under?

A: Shows on elevation, about 7' above adjacent grade.

Q: Is there nanny suite, where you have mechanical space?

A: Yes, outside of it.

Q: Tons of double height space, 7 of them? Sloping ceiling... roof... vertical space have volume is encouraged.

A: Parking is not counted... living space will count, garage will not.

Q: How are you going to address the coach house and the home very close to the proposed building? Is there a bylaw prohibiting blocking the view of others? The impact on the property will have on east side is a question?

A: My choice would be the bigger elevation one, not overly done.

Q: Do you see any connection...though colour will be the same. The coach house is from another era?

A: Hard to match the house.

Q: What is the material of the house? Slate could be used as landscaped elements.

A: Use terrace as a transition. It will be solid, blend in as part of landscape.

Q: You are blocking the neighbour's house, about 30' to their property.

A: Actually the real distance is more...Originally FS is to build the bigger houses... It is way beyond when the house was first built. It is not much from a heritage point of view to limiting the distance.

Comments from Planning and Questions to Panel:

The Director of Planning asks for your comments on

- The approach to retention, including the proposed locations for the retained building
- For comments on the proposed new residence , with regard to the intent and principles of the FSD ODP and Guidelines; and in particular on
- The proposed height relaxation for the roof appurtenance (tower).

Comments:

- The current house has no architectural merit.
- Like the roof line. It is a rich building on all levels and outstanding. Run by your client and see if it needs to be so large... First Shaughnessy area is to remind the style of the time. And we should be speaking for now and not the past. This is a tough call.
- Progression is important in the neighborhood
- Talking about the design. It is one of the biggest properties in Shaughnessy. Why should you put a house on the back corner and block the neighbor's living space?
- Shock of condoning the house coming down. The scale of things in terms of the building and in terms of its configuration. It is a large piece of property.
- Maybe preserve a little bit of house, and having something to look at. There is no artistic relationship with the main building. The east elevation, the roof doesn't have a relationship with the house. West elevation and working out the gable, etc. East elevation is most problematic.
- No landscaping. I will fully support increasing the height of the house, higher in relationship with the other houses on The Crescent.
- Should not attach the coach house to the building.
- Retaining of the home is not the best idea, I agree with the others.
- The coach house should not be in the back or any kind of garage. You have four-car garage and should have beautiful garden that compliments the home
- When I did the site visit, I was disappointed at the condition. Not sure what the interior condition was like. We are always trying to save environment. Tons of garbage. I will support losing the old house. Impressed with the manual drawings and time you spend on designing different options, and by putting all of these together with landscaping so it is not just a big house.
- To address saving the old building, I tend to hold the same view and would not be good too close to the new building. It shouldn't be put in the back either as it comprises the neighbors too much because of the height and the proximity. It is their living room right there. I like one of the other member's comments and there should be no accessory building, allow to be a deck and side yard. The front façade is elegant. The other two elevations need work as well, you need to make it as elegant as front.
- Concerns about pool and sunken yard. It needs a really strong relationship with the house and it is too blocky.
- No building at back and require an elegant landscape to be able to see from the back.

Chair's Summary:

In general, the members liked the concept and believe that the existing home doesn't need to be saved. Relaxation for tower is fine. The coach house/garage in the back impacts the neighbours' too much and intrudes on the home. Panel look forward for the 2nd submission with a new house design with a full landscape plan attached.

MOTION: To come back for a second Enquiry with the above comments addressed.

- Seconded and
- All in favour, and Carried.

Meeting Adjourned.

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