

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

MINUTES from the meeting of March 25, 2010, 4:00 pm

Present:	Lori Kozub	Chair SHPOA
	David Cuan	Resident - SHPOA
	Erika Gardner	Resident - SHPOA
	Victor Piller	Resident - SHPOA
	Wilfred Ng	Resident Member at Large
	Phil Yacht	Resident Member at Large
	Loy Leyland	AIBC
	Michelle McMaster	BCSLA
	Paul Sangha	BCSLA
	Judith Hansen	Heritage Commission
	Lisa MacIntosh	Real Estate Board
Regrets:	Mamie Angus	Resident Member at Large
	Lu Tang	AIBC
Abstaining(Items 1,2):	Loy Leyland	AIBC
City Staff :	Ann McLean	Development Planner, UDDPC
Recording Secretary:	Michelle McMaster	

AGENDA

- Business:
1. Review of Minutes of January 21, 2010
 2. Recent Projects Update
- New Business:
1. Address: 3738 Hudson Street
Inquirer: Loy Leyland Architect Inc.
Status: Second Enquiry (previous review July 24, 2008)
 2. Address: 1052 Wolfe Avenue
Inquirer: Loy Leyland Architect Inc.
Status: Second Enquiry (previous review January 21, 2010)
 3. Address: 3389 Cypress Street
Inquirer: Raffaele and Associates
Status: Third Enquiry (previous reviews November 19 and December 19, 2009)

MEETING:

Business, 4:00 – 4:30pm:

1. Review of January 21, 2010 Minutes:
 - No comments or corrections.All supported a MOTION to approve minutes made by Lisa MacIntosh.

2. Discussion: No Quorum for two of three projects under review this meeting due to abstention of one AIBC member and absence of the other. Discussion of increase in responsibility laid on a professional when abstention of the other is required. In this circumstance the professional with added responsibility is also our volunteer secretary, which is perhaps not in the best interest of the panel. Professionals bring much valued expertise to the panel. Conclusions: panel should proceed with meeting although without quorum; it is preferable that professionals on panel do not take secretary role; SHPOA members to seek a volunteer for Minutes; AIBC members to determine if another member should be found to replace the frequently abstaining member.
3. Recent Projects Update:
 - 1551 Laurier – new dormer and interior renovations
 - 3538 Cypress – renovations to upper storey sunroom
 - 1550 Angus Drive – rear addition to pre-1940's house
 - 3699 Osler – garage & pool cabana

New Business, 4:30 -6:30 pm:

1. MOTION: No request should be made to this panel to demolish, substantially alter, or relocate a pre-1940's house in First Shaughnessy without permitting a Site Visit to view the exterior of the house, and possibly permitting view of the interior, by members of this panel prior to deliberations. All supported this MOTION made by Victor Piller.

NO QUORUM for the following portion of meeting, until noted otherwise –

2. 3738 Hudson Street
Presentation by Loy Leyland, architect:
 - Package presented with many drawings to demonstrate extent of Retention studies for this pre-1940's house. Applicant requests panel direction regarding Retention feasibility and consideration of Proposed New House plans
 - After much study architect concludes demolition necessary to meet client's program objectives.
 - Heritage assessment states house does not have significant merit
 - New house to keep memory of existing, by using same stylistic vernacular, materials, site access points and massing along the street.
 - Retaining perimeter landscape and vehicular access.
 - Size: 14,000 sq ft permitted and proposed.
 - Landscape to have an open feel.Questions:
 - What is FSR of existing house? Approximately 6000 sq ft. (guess).
 - What trees are to be retained or removed? Perimeter trees to be retained. Losing 2 trees in center of lot, within new building footprint.

- Is the new house proposal over the maximum allowable site coverage? No
- Is it possible to visit the site? Owner (present at meeting) gives permission, including interior. Architect to arrange time with Chair
- Heritage report (pg. 6) says because the house is the last original house on the block its Contextual Value is reduced (being without its original context). Can this be correct? It seems contrary, and should have more Value, because it is the last example. Response: This is why so much study went into trying to preserve the existing house.

Planning Comments and Questions to the Panel:

The FSAD Panel reviewed the existing house and property in July 2008. The Panel did not form unanimous opinion on whether the house should be retained, but asked for exploration of retention. It was also noted that the existing streetscape should be maintained.

While Planning has not had an opportunity to thoroughly review all options, we do feel that some of the retention/renovation options proposed show real potential. We could likely support those options that propose moving the existing house forward. The options that place this home in the rear are seen as less successful. As part of the retention, we recommend that the distinctive elements of the front façade be retained.

Questions to Panel:

The Director of Planning seeks your comments on this proposal with regard to opportunities for retention, the proposed relocation of the existing building, and, alternately should you support a new residence, your comments on the proposed new house with regard to the broad goals of the FSD ODP and Guidelines.

Comments:

- Would like to see more effort to preserve existing. Consider example on 1551 Angus Dr, Thomas Shaughnessy's home, an expansion to the rear of the property.
- Want to walk around house before commenting.
- Don't support new house. Want to see Retention. Massing of new one would stand out on the street.
- Like simplicity of existing house and would like to retain. What is the necessity of the new house proposed size?
- Site coverage – new house is too large. I don't insist it be demolished
- Streetscape feel is not being addressed by such a big difference in square footage
- Last remaining heritage building can be very important, not less important.
- Don't support 'facading', which is not encouraged by heritage people.
- Don't think the Luxon heritage report actually supports demolition, and think its worth retention

- Regarding intent to design with the memory of the demolished house – Can't rebuild heritage.
- Existing is quite a nice house. Unfortunate architect thinks it can't be made to work due to owner's program and interests.
- Guidelines say we have a role in heritage preservation.

Comments Summary:

- 6 of 8 in favor of Retention or further alternatives
- Size of proposed house is too large for the neighborhood.
- Want to view property again (last Panel viewing was in 2008).

3. 1052 Wolfe

Presentation by Loy Leyland, architect:

- Earlier Panel comments have been addressed. Changes include:
- House placement & streetscape relationships with neighbors. Not quite at front setback. Neighbors like the location.
- Entry to front door & grade – more gradual with terraced approach.
- House is as low in grade as it can be.
- Revised driveway elevation
- Materials: stucco, wood trim, granite
- All parking is now under the house footprint.

Presentation by David Rose, landscape architect:

- Existing wall along street frontage is to be rebuilt. New wall shorter, maximum 4' height, and with granite pilasters. Bank grade above.
- Layered planting & hedge along frontage, formal.
- Entry is a terraced approach to the front door, with small seatwall at the outer edge of the upper landing.
- Rear water feature & daybed feature along center axis.
- Parking modified – stair to rear reduced in scale & centered on wall
- Existing trees – driveway relocated to keep chestnut, relocating 2 mature Rhododendrons.

Questions:

- What is a daybed? Furniture for lounging upon.
- Using existing stone when rebuilding front retaining wall? No. Extending existing one next door.
- Privacy along north side? Seems very exposed. Neighbor has trees planted which fill in apparent gaps on plan. Using birch trees this property which won't cast too much shade northward onto neighbor.
- Dropped front retaining wall height - Can lawn along front work as shown with new top of bank closer to house? Yes.
- Screening of porch landing to street? Yes, with hedge.

Planning Comments and Questions to the Panel:

The FSAD Panel reviewed this proposal in January of this year. The Panel noted that standard ODP setbacks should be respected, the garage be reduced, the design be reconsidered and the architecture and landscape be better "knitted".

The Planning department does not support the current design. Chiefly this is because the response to the particular topography of the site, the location of adjacent homes, and the development of a streetscape in keeping with the FSD ODP and Guidelines, is not felt to be successful. Further, elements of the design such as the roof form, and tripartite expression will require further development to meet the objectives of the ODP and Guidelines. The project is before you today at the request of the enquirer.

Questions to 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 specific regard to the siting of the building in consideration of the particular topography, shape and adjacencies of this site?

Comments:

- House too far forward. Was hoping house could be shortened to keep rear the same but move front away from street.
- Improvements – parking more reasonable.
- House too far forward.
- Aesthetic - don't like architectural elements vocabulary to enhance what's happening on the site.
- Assessing plant layering difficult without plant list
- Building feels forced onto street & front stairs onto driveway
- Hedge won't give same layering as softer planting
- Pedestrian entrance "forecourt" would de-emphasize chute-like feel of driveway
- Attention needed to the elevational detailing of driveway walls
- Soften side façade.
- Back garden disjointed – north side connects better to garden than the axial relationship. Open patio more to lawn to emphasize size of property.
- House looks stuffed into its lot. Not estate-like. Too close to other houses. Needs a lot of work.
- Thanks for garage improvements.
- House too massive, because of its height relative to the street.
- Like depth of back garden.
- Support last speaker's comments.
- Doesn't meet ODP guidelines. Instead it's maximizing square footage.
- Want it more nestled in site.
- In favor of more set-back. Like staggered front entry.
- More open rear patio/lawn relationship.
- Uneasy feeling with house close to roadway as shown, with height difference – street to Main floor grade- Is it possible on this site to get close to the square footage allowed AND respect the ODP guidelines? A difficult site.

Comments Summary:

- Current design doesn't support ODP
- May need to make a smaller home in order to make a better home.

QUORUM present for following portion of meeting.

4. 3389 Cypress Street

Presentation by Raffaele & Associates, designer:

- Since last meeting
 - roof simplified
 - front elevation revised
 - square footage reduced, including garage (to 3 car)
 - revised access to basement from rear

Presentation by Damon Oriente, landscape architect:

- Changes to building square footage meant more garden space to work with.
- Cypress Street has a variable streetscape context, other neighbors have perimeter wall, so its not bad
- Cypress Street treatment therefore using wall, because don't want the visual flow, but have reduced wall length and soften each corner with more planting.
- Flipped entry offset so it cuddles up to heavier planting at corner.
- Curved planting following turret, for soft density at the lower level using flowering trees under the existing trees.
- Reduced some grass area.
- Repeat curving planting bed on west side
- Rear patio organized around a circulation node with offset dining patio reduced in size. Still keeping separation from neighbor across the lane.

Questions:

- Grades? Site quite flat. 5 steps to grade from main floor level.
- Architecture to turret porch – Is it possible to delete pilasters & extend short columns to full height, and eliminate railings, to make a connection to garden? Yes.
- Back porch feels pinched. Can stairs be wrapped, and widened? No railing? Will look at it.

Planning Comments and Questions to the Panel:

The Panel last saw this proposal in December of last year. The Panel asked that the roofline be simplified, that FSR issues be resolved, and that the landscape plan be updated and included with the next presentation.

The Planning department recognizes that improvements have been made to the proposal.

Questions to Panel:

Has the proposal adequately addressed the previous comments of the Panel? Do you have further comments with regard to the general requirement of the FSD ODP and Guidelines?

Comments:

- Design has significantly improved. (3 panel members commented)
- Canopy around turret to over front porch is good, as is basement access.
- Railings vocabulary or its presence needs more attention.
- Meets FSR now, good.
- Open back porch & front turret (no railings if possible) (4 panel members commented)
- Foundation planting feels pressed against the house
- Rear is broken into two spaces, patio and corner. Could be opened up to make corner part of dining room.
- More landscape design information needed. Didn't have copy of design for review prior to meeting.
- Much improved house and landscape – landscape is estate-like.
- Like design.
- Efforts at addressing ODP show
- Elongate column and lighten railings is a good idea to more closely integrate landscape and house.
- Scale, size, placement of windows good
- Gable ends may not be necessary.
- Use hip roof, softer & more elegant;
- Cupola could be dropped down a bit more;
- Eyebrow window could be narrower;
- Window pattern could be simplified on rear elevation

Comments summary:

- Thank you for addressing earlier Panel comments
- Attention to Landscape related comments & some tweaking to house as suggested to the front columns and railing around turrets, gable ends, simplified rear window patterns.

MOTION to proceed with application with comments addressed. Loy Leyland proposed David Cuan seconded. All supported.

Meeting adjourned 6:30pm