

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

MINUTES from the meeting of April 1, 2010, 4:00 pm

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

AGENDA

- Business:
1. Review of Minutes of March 25, 2010
 2. Recent Projects Updates.

- New Business:
1. Address: 1426 Angus Drive
Inquirer: Formwerks Architectural
Status: First Enquiry
 2. Address: 1527 King Edward
Inquirer: B.L. Ling Architect
Status: Second Enquiry
 3. Address: 1288 The Crescent
Inquirer: Loy Leyland Architect Inc.
Status: Second Enquiry

Business, 4:00 – 4:30pm:

1. Review of March 25, 2010 Minutes:
 - No comments or corrections.

2. Recent Projects Update:
 - 1664 Cedar Crescent – This property containing a pre-1940s may be considered for a new Single Family Dwelling without exploring retention of the existing dwelling. The existing home is of small size (2200sf), a square form that would be difficult to add to, and is centrally located on the lot. The property is not of an adequate size to qualify for an infill.

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

1. 1426 Angus Drive
Presented by Formwerks Architectural
 - Heritage designated and in character with Shaughnessy.
 - Proposed to put an infill at the back.
 - Infill house need access from fire trucks and is supported by the fire Department.
 - Modifying the porte cochere.
 - Design to appear as a detached garage.
 - Infill house conform to style of original house. Keeping the exterior of the house.
 - Significant glass surrounding the pool at the garden not visible from the streets.
 - Large hedge at the rear property line as a property line to separate house from coach house.
 - Add a couple of terraces at the back of the house.
 - Taking away unwanted space of 2 bed rooms.
 - Carport integrating with the style of the house.

Questions

- Removing existing carport? - currently existing & non-conforming
- Intend to sell of coach house? – I don't know
- Can you explain the fixed modular skylights for the pool and back of the house modified with overhead? – There will be glass will be doors that will open
- How does the hedge separate coach house? It will be a tall hedge to provide privacy for both
- Gate house at property line disliked by planning department? Yes, for additional parking but Planning did not support it
- Carport count as FSR? Yes
- Proposed infill house can it be stratified? Don't know
- Geometry of garage, what transpire the intended changes? Keeping in line with the previous design

Planning Comments:

The Planning Department supports the retention of this pre 1940s home, listed as a “C” on the Vancouver Heritage Register, and this preliminary proposal in general. The size of this property and existing home allows for one infill dwelling unit.

Questions to Panel:

The Director of Planning seeks your comments on the

- proposed location and character of the infill,
- the required fire access,
- the proposed additions to the main house including the garage, and
- any other issues relevant to the FSD ODP and Guidelines.

Comments

- Thank you for not wanting to tear it down
- Good presentation. A lot of transparency
- Proposed additions to the main house including garage are nice
- Need to enhance brick materials with the rest of the building. Use wood elements.
- Skylights a solid mass, introduce courtyard, make it appear detached, sunlight and daylight in the kitchen.
- Landscaping system of the hedge is good
- Focal point for sitting on the deck – sculpture, trees
- Light in the kitchen might be too dark and needs addressing.
- Existing porte cochere use as a deck? No intention
- Process of getting to the infill – buffer between light well is crucial, proposed hedges- too much paving appears too strong and can it be reduced
- Might need more parking space.
- Planning should give more latitude in regards to retention.
- Support for maintaining the house, garage door of infill house looks appealing.
- Support for little gate house
- Relaxation – for retaining pre 1940 house?

Summary: The Panel is generally likes and supports the proposed infill housing. There is mixed comments on the gatehouse but pleased with the initial start.

Motion: To proceed to development with landscape planning and comments addressed. Seconded, All Supported

2. 1527 King Edward

Presented by B.L. Ling Architect

- Developed landscape plan further since last enquiry

- Detailed presentation
- Proposed modification to the hedges. Front hedges are very large, old hemlock & has suffered over the years.
- Removing part of hedge at South side of King Edward & keeping part of it.
- Removal of the hedges on east property
- Unique shape developed front garden room. Not cutting into it and maintain integrity to act as a buffer.
- Alberta Spruce in front yard maintained. Front yard similar to concept last presented.
- Structured garden will make home look larger. Side garden dominated by pine trees retained.
- On the west side there is an extension of garden terraces.
- Provide planted buffer in light of the development of a new home building porte cochere next door.
- Series of rooms structured using hedging and plantings. Will be using a lot of boxwood.
- Building design concept remained the same. There is layering on the front door vertically. Material remains same.
- Series of terraces of rooms without roofs should be well defined.
- Additional single garage requested. Trellis in the front will have more articulation.

Questions

- Is the trellis in the front open work? Yes
- The sunken garden – not accessible from ground, raised planter 16 inches with paving to match? Main floor 3 feet from the ground.
- East patio – hard surfaced and a will below maintenance garden. Surrounded by box wood etchings. Will be an urban garden. Will there be more softening? There will be more paving with planting in between.
- Geometry on north side of family room is different. Bay window is not typical? Will there be planting beds insert to balance out for the unique shape? Haven't decided yet
- Considerations for potential connections of the family room? Client preferred to put furniture in front of window.

Planning Comments:

The FSAD Panel reviewed this proposal at our meeting December 10, 2009. The Panel supported the overall approach to the design, but asked for strengthening of some of the architectural elements including the entry, and integration with the landscape.

Questions to Panel:

Has the proposal advanced and responded to the Panel's comments? Do you have further comments relevant to the FSD ODP and Guidelines?

Comments

- Lots of depth and integration with lot. Might be better if there is twice the size to work with. Consistency translates into the landscape element with artistic quality.
- Horizontality for the lot achieved. Cleanness to the illustration and strength of the roofline. The existing hedge issue is fine to take out. It integrates with the new wall. Sequencing of rooms is interesting
- East elevation not as interesting as the others. High chimney result in various issues.
- Landscaping issues - light well at the back is not connected to the yard at all. Looks outstanding from basement.
- East elevation a little flat. Corner needs softening up. A lot more detail from enquiry stage.
- Too much intensity into the lot and feels packed. Layering and terraces requires more area.
- Water feature needs to be more artistic. The hardscape requires grass or thyme in between the pavers to soften up the look
- Need access of garden from the family room.
- Single garage & double garage works well. Patio might be used more than intended.
- Design rational for lower roof might need to be looked at. Use wood structure and one layer of roofing.
- Support sunken patio. Nice to have basement.
- North west corner door needs to be more detailed
- Roof overhang different than trellis at the back. Two different styles. Roof material not porous - does not feel like trellis. Skirt feels awkward.

Summary: The panel appreciates the architectural concept and feels the project has come a long way. East elevation gable could be flatten or soften. The front needs to be addressed with a water feature and softened the hardscape . More consideration of the back access of the family room.

Motion: To move the project forward to development board with comments addressed. Seconded, All in favor

3. 1288 The Crescent – No Quorum

Presentation by Loy Leyland, architect:

- Responding to comments from last time
 - Parking underneath terrace instead of retention of current home. More open space.
- Original roof retains the most powerful form from a street-point view from east elevation.
- Larger trees on the sides. Neighbour has far so more privacy.
- Landscape – mixed with formal and informal. Asymmetrical balance on

the house.

- Front of the house will be classic Shaughnessy structure.
- Replacing hedge plantations. Keeping large trees and existing trees.
- Move the driveway to one side. Parking divided by 2 garages and at grade.
- Terraces – lounging, sunny & variations. Going around the lawn area.
- Maximum light to basement. Below grade.
- Green wall allow natural light at the light well.
- Expression of lawn – informal with a pond and a pavilion at the corner competing with each other. Pavilion can look at from the outside dining room. Children’s garden /playhouse visible from house.

Questions

- Grades – difference in lawn level, paring...etc. terrace 3 half feet. Pool terrace 8-10 feet. No impact on existing tree. Parking – ramp 4 feet.
- Cutout at the back. If purchasable?
- Light well – sufficient natural light get to the basement?
- Pool on the terrace? No
- South elevation option A & B – roof being the main difference.

Planning Comments:

The Panel last saw this proposal on January 21st this year. Panel members were not in favour of the retention of the existing house as proposed, and asked for development of the landscape plan.

Planning is not ready to dismiss the opportunity for retention and would like to explore it further.

Questions to Panel:

The enquirer is seeking specific direction with regard to landscape approach, parking and development of the east and south elevations. Please provide your comments with regard to the FSD ODP and Guidelines.

Comments:

- Plan needs more work and integration for my comments
- Like dual garage idea
- Like the garden/pavilion
- Like initial landscaping
- Large terrace nice
- Would like to see retention of home
- Garden a good start
- Concerns of the bulk of the house, doesn’t fit into neighboring homes
- Too massive
- Emphasis on garden
- Coming along
- Good feel to the project
- Like the formal/informal approach

- Like original plans

Summary: I believe you should review the comments addressed in particular to present one house plan to the Panel as a starting point so we can start to provide specific feedback.