

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

MINUTES from the meeting of April 15, 2010, 4:00 pm

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

AGENDA

- Business:
1. FSD Permits Presentation
 2. Review of Minutes of April 1, 2010
 3. Recent Projects Updates.
- New Business:
1. Address: 1300 West 15th Avenue
Inquirer: Formwerks Architectural
Status: First Enquiry
 2. Address: 1351 Laurier Avenue
Inquirer: Loy Leyland Architect
Status: Second Enquiry

Business 4:00 – 5:00pm:

1. FSD Permit Presentation by John Greer, Processing Centre Manager
2. Review of April 1, 2010 Minutes:
 - Insert comments about Councilor Chow's comments regarding updating FSODP as Judith Hansen requested
 - To be reviewed next meeting due to some Panel members not receiving Minutes in email

3. Recent Projects Update:
 - 1778 Cedar Crescent – minor permits approved on interior of existing house

New Business, 5:00 -6:00 pm:

1. 1300 West 15th Avenue
Presented by Formwerks Architectural
 - Main house with an proposed infill house
 - Different approach to the townhouse design
 - Front elevation of the house – enhanced front entrance, curbed roof, changed windows & propose in the front patio like doors for the other two doors
 - The front entrance is now more organized to keep full precedence to the characteristics of the house and prevent from being too similar to a townhouse complex.
 - Modifications to the backyard.
 - Pedestrian entrance – 3 entrance that frames the front garden field
 - Keeping fruit trees on the front lawn
 - Consider keeping Japanese maple and magnolia & other smaller trees
 - Roof at the back - 3 ft extension, cut back by 1 ½ ft from the eaves
 - Relocate heritage house further to the west to enhance it
 - Infill house – keep to 1 & half storey expression
 - Underground parking, not visible from property
 - Front yard – oval shaped lawn with a strong main entrance, augmented buffers & added layers to screen the street; to promote an estate like feeling
 - Front house plantations - slightly raised, loose planting at the front, much more space for each unit with their own private garden,
 - Both units have generous planting,

Questions & Answers

- East side of house – elevation, a rapid change in grade between patio & lawn. Will it be too steep? - There will be sloping towards the lawn to the north & a low wall. Would not be too significant
- Any reason not to keep 2 big trees in the front along the driveway? - Too close given a 1 meter setback at the property line. Will further investigate
- Privacy on the east door to the west side? More plantations? - Will put more plantations.
- Existing glazing of the house is it single? Some location is single, other areas will be double glazing. - The intent is to replace all of the windows to mitigate noise.

- Would this be precedent setting for future projects due to the modifications of frontage of the house? - No.
- Does the view from the front of the coach house to the main house work in terms of privacy? - Coach house is slightly higher facing South patio. Planting proposed is burning bush, rhodos, hedges & Japanese snowball trees for buffering. There is a need to beef up the privacy of the patio with something more evergreen.
- Does the doors from the kitchen & dining from the infill look straight out to visitor parking? – No a fence along the east side of visitor parking is there to separate it.
- Any explanation why the current driveway isn't maintained for characteristics of a Shaughnessy residence? - The change is mainly for fire truck access. Meeting next week with fire department to work on issue.
- Are the front layer plantings in character with Shaughnessy? We will loosen evergreen planting - evergreen shrubs 4-5 ft high cedar trees plantings that cascades on the edge of the wall.
- Registered heritage building? - No. pre 1940s.
- Any consideration given to color? - Light butter yellow doors, dark charcoal roof.
- Rest of lawn areas common property? - Undetermined. Visitor's parking to underground parking pathway? Yes.
- Strata line? – It is free hold strata property 4 separate titles not subdivided, will be designated when they do the final planning.
- Height of main house higher than permitted? The height is same as the existing house which is 42 ft.

Planning Comments:

The FSAD Panel reviewed this proposal as an enquiry on October 29th and December 10th of last year and reviewed several options at that time. The Panels latest comments asked that the main house have entry issues resolved – both to driveway and unit entries; and that the infill be designed to be distinct from the principal house.

The Planning Department supports the retention of this pre 1940s home. The size of the existing house allows for a Multiple Conversion Dwelling; the property and existing home allows for one infill dwelling unit.

Questions to Panel:

The Director of Planning seeks your comments on the

- character and massing of the infill,
- the proposed siting and additions to the main house, and
- any other issues relevant to the FSD ODP and Guidelines.

Comments

- I would like you to retain the 3 trees at front corner. - Infill to mid-point is 145 feet – cannot be narrow. Criteria of keeping the trees is in discussion with fire department.
- Good way of diminishing townhouse feel
- Rear plantings between 2 houses is critical. The plants used needs to be reconsidered. Some are too tight. Use different figuration of paving.
- How visitors move from visitor parking – needs to be fixed to create more of a private area. The gardens should surround the infill & house for privacy. Directing visitors will be conflicting and will be intruding. Creating private space will be a better trade off.
- Need screening for the infill unit kitchen from the vehicles coming from the lane.
- Front yard – it is formal oval approach and I am alright with the walks from the 2 sides but the central walk is awkward from the main house going down to the road.
- Paving treatment - 3 different paving treatments shown with no note on their intention; feels awkward for the drop off area with non residential feel.
- Need hedges on west side – require further screening from neighbor
- Sighting orientation is better with gravel stone.
- Main entrance can be enhanced with side lights
- Don't like center pathway, change needed in the front lawn
- Like west elevation massing
- Easement in back needs to be addressed
- Privacy issues with the west visitor parking spot
- Coach house should be slightly smaller to create better distance,
- Front pillars – brings attention to the side door. Draws attention and gives a townhouse feel
- The lawn is too structured and plain (just grass). An object, like a fountain or benches or areas of use can improve this. There should be more usage of that piece of property
- Infill house and main house proximity is an issue
- House being pulled forward from original – seems like some effect to the view to the subject property to the immediate east resulting in losing some of their view
- Center more prominent than the front – fine as long as not precedent setting. Brick replace by stone is good but the back is a little bit tight and would be uncomfortable to live in the coach house.
- Front garden very structured but the diagonal access is too severe looking.
- Planting doesn't achieve the character of the massing - the landscape can soften the relationship between 2 buildings
- Too much lawn for the density, take the lawn out
- Character of the infill should match the principle residence – there is too much change of character of the property

- Driveway - bring the scale of driveway down, 2 pedestrian entrance causes confusion
- Front - principal hierarchy of importance should be principle entrance, not enough massing on the east side
- Privacy issues on the west side
- Reduce ribbons of planting and add more variation of mass planting
- Garage entrance causes confusion getting to the driveway
- Too much lawn for the density – need to take out lawn area so more planted zone and more circulation between 2 houses
- Rear area fence screening needs more planting between visitor parking and barbeque patio of the infill
- Elegant, like the cottage feel

Summary: The project has come developed nicely with the elimination of the townhouse characteristics. But there are mixed feelings on the proposed infill, character and its massing. The focus for this project is to address the landscape issues which at this time require a lot of effort.

Motion: Return for a second review of the DE application with above comments addressed.

Seconded and all in favor.

Carried

2. 1351 Laurier Avenue
Withdrawn from Agenda by Loy Leyland