

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

MINUTES from the meeting of May 6, 2010, 4:00 pm

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

AGENDA

- Business:
1. Review of Minutes of April 1 & 15, 2010
 2. Recent Projects Updates.

- New Business:
1. Address: 1550 Angus Drive
Inquirer: Stuart Howard Architects Inc.
Status: DE Application (DE413688)
Review: First
 2. Address: 1539 West King Edward
Inquirer: Jakobsen Associates
Status: DE Application (DE413787)
Review: First

Business, 4:00 – 4:30pm:

1. Review of April 1, 2010 Minutes:
 - No comments or corrections.Motion to pass; seconded
- Review of April 15, 2010 Minutes:
- No comments or corrections.
- Motion to pass; seconded

2. Recent Projects Update:
 - No new DE's or Enquiries

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

1. 1550 Angus Drive
Presented by Stuart Howard Architects Inc and Ron Rule Consultants Ltd
 - Proposed to remove veranda that was done in the 1950's and integrate the roof.
 - Proposed to remove addition done a few years ago for kitchen, sitting area & fireplace for a more family oriented space, the new addition occupies the same space but projects further back about 5 more ft.
 - Have a permit to rebuild basement, lowering basement 1 ft and a half, new staircase goes to basement
 - Porte cochere relocating farther to the south, not so close to the neighbours.
 - Retaining stone foundation of the basement.
 - To the rear of the building, lowering the roof pitch, making the connection of the addition unique, skylights on the east side, new windows on the north side since no more veranda issue.
 - Landscaping - not making anything higher, clear the rear to setback the view for the building,
 - Garage - existing is a problem for the driveway. It is in bad shape and needs rebuilding. . The only way to get out is by backing up to Angus Street.
 - Proposed to move garage - turned it 90 degrees which the door faces east rather than north allowing vehicle to turn around and drive out.
 - Upgrading windows while maintaining same style. Replacing front windows on the second floor while maintaining symmetry of the design
 - Interior rearrangements - have impact on exterior looking. Exterior needs rebuilding on the South side , which has sunlight and rain damage, shingles - all need replacement.
 - Plywood box – unheated and looks like part of the building, proposed to make it heated and rebuild it to fit in character of the house
 - Landscape plans: open up sunlight & playing areas, aiming formality without rigidity. Combination of English in the front and French design in the back, opening up the gardens
 - Want to avoid diagonal walk from gate while keep paving down
 - Introducing a combination of gravel and pavers

Questions

- Existing trees? Which ones are proposing to move or retain? Trees that have grown close and lost natural form. No specific tree other than the dogwood tree. Arborist report is in progress.
- Trees in front of garage potted? Planted on the surface of the gravel. Japanese maple, fairly small scale leafy tree.

- Holly tree at the garden? Is crowding the house & at best needs relocation. Need to simplify and make it more useful.
- Change of grade along driveway? No.
- Garage seems awkward. Could you consider turn table to garage? Yes.
- Lightwell from the northeast corner. Consider moving to the south side
- Privacy issues to the south. Proposed planting? A green leaf beach blocking the canopy. Not as tight as a hedge but it will form.
- Any remnant of the existing garden be saved or all new planting? Original garden is well published? Current garden is 2004. The current proposed garden is closer to original 1940.
- The planting in the front? Planting on the west side significantly reduced? Selectively reduced. The streetwall gate will remain.

Planning Comments:

The FSAD Panel did not review this proposal at the enquiry stage, due its design development concurrence with the Olympic Games.

The Planning Department supports the retention of this pre-1940s home.

Questions to Panel:

The Director of Planning seeks your comments on the

- character, massing and location of the addition;
- the removal of the existing front porch;
- the proposed arrangement for parking, and
- any other issues relevant to the FSD ODP and Guidelines.

Comments

- Appreciate the removal of the '50s additions.
- Parking is an issue but no real solution but to restructure.
- The flow of the landscape needs to be more resolved. Would like to see more evolution of the connections of the house & garden. Privacy issue to the south, there is a need to remove some of the birch trees to the side.
- Parking. Don't like the parking spot. Odd in backyard. But not sure if solution is feasible. Moving to the original parking spot is better. Landscape needs more detail and arborist's report.
- Removal of front porch is good but not convinced about the balcony.
- Security issues. Agree on addition and good to take it out.
- Proposed porte cochere is odd. Location of porte cochere needs to further south.
- Lightwell on the driveway side looks too tight. Skylights located very sensitively. The separation between the old & new is good.
- Garage - there might not be enough clearance space for vehicles. Garage will still be difficult to move in and out. Use the maple tree spot to make a T backing up space.

- Landscape – need of arborist’s report. The formalized section in front of house is too strong. Feels cut off from the lawn. The paving to the driveway seems more modern and needs to fit to the stylistic area.
- Patio space might not suit family style. Passerby will see nothing along the driveway. Needs to insert a feature.
- Location of garage - Views from the driveway is plain. Needs plantings or features. Push garage back a bit.
- Balcony - Use more natural material if possible if replacing roof. House is slightly angled. Landscape issue. The scale feels rigid. Garden scale is not right with the house.
- Fountain needs to be pulled away and pavement needs pattern.
- Need connections to the steps leading to backdoor.

Summary: The Panel is pleased with the retention the home and the owners’ focus to take it back to more of its authentic design . We would like to see a solution to the garage location, an arborist report and more detailed landscape plan.

Motion: To see the DE for a second time with comments addressed particularly the landscape.

Seconded: All in Favor

2. 1539 West King Edward Ave

Presented by Jacobsen Associates and Donna Chomichuk

- Proposed 2 car garage. Storm water tank near automobile gate.
- Terrace in the middle for sunlight purpose.
- Craftsmen style & detailing.
- Color rendering. Stained shingles, trim color and basalt as base material.
- Driveway – porte cochere may or may not be approved. Strong historical precedent of the presence of porte cochere.
- Addressed issues about driveway too long – have set the gate back to reduce distance
- Addressed issues about stain finish rather than paint finish – stain finish is 1910s is more appropriate for historical purposes
- Maximum lawn area as the owner requested
- Parking at the back – 2 configurations to choose from.
- Kept many existing trees.
- Issue on landscape layering – sketch provided.
- Multiple layering in front and on sides.

Questions

- Are there any trees being cut down? 5 apple and cherry trees.
- 2 bbqs – is it a fireplace and bbq? 4 person front and bbq at the back
- Roof –cedar shingles?

Planning Comments:

The FSAD Panel reviewed the existing property at our meeting October 29, 2009. The Panel generally supported the design, but asked for some strengthening of the design concept and design development to address the long driveway. We must clarify that the porte cochere proposed does not comply with the required side yard setback.

Questions to Panel:

The Director of Planning asks if your previous comments have been addressed, and for any further comments on the proposal with regard to the FSD ODP and Guidelines.

Comments

- Porte cochere issue of projecting into driveway – do not see as distraction. Makes the building look bigger.
- Porte cochere is to mitigate length of driveway – don't think it should be there since it is not approvable.
- Porte cochere adds design but is a tall feature and an infringement of the neighbour.
- Landscaping – flip the water feature to the other side of the space to open more green space.
- Landscape - provided buffer from the house to the west to side of terrace. Supported design – good improvement. Nice scheme.
- Garage – garden shed and recycling – not get put in landscape design enough. Not clear on FSR issue. Accommodating those for functional spaces rather than additional car park.
- Mechanical room – increases coverage of the land. Should not impact space which affects exterior appearance of the house.

Summary: Well addressed on previous comments. Porte cochere looks nice from a design perspective but infringes on neighbour. Landscape plan is detailed and all approve in general.

Motion: To accept the project with comments addressed.

Seconded; All in Favor