

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

MINUTES from the meeting of July 29th, 2010, 4:00 pm

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

AGENDA

Business: 1. Review of Minutes of July 8, 2010
 2. Recent Projects Updates.

New Business: 1. Address: 1052 Wolfe Avenue
 Inquirer: Loy Leyland Architect Inc.
 Status: Third Inquiry
 (Previous Reviews Jan 21 & Mar 25, 2010)

Business, 4:00 – 4:30pm:

1. Review of July 8, 2010 Minutes:
 - Under **Comments** note: “do not support thin plywood cover on the trellis”.
Motion carried.

2. Recent Projects Update:
 - 1539 West King Edward – The project is approved with conditions.
 - 1838 West 19th – Permit to repair the retaining wall and driveway.
 - 1819 Hosmer – Minor alterations are being requested. This will come to the Panel.

3. Amendments to the FSODP :
 - Planner advised that all changes, even minor amendments, to the FSODP have to undergo public hearings. Some members questioned if this is necessary; previous updates to the bylaw may not have gone through public hearings. Planner to confirm this at the next meeting.
 - Panel members are reminded that FSADP may voice their non-support of large bulky homes resulting from the unfettered use of double height rooms and parking stalls located within the main house of the proposed development. It is the mandate of FSADP to only support proposals that are compatible with the scale and character of the existing homes in First Shaughnessy.

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

1. 1052 Wolfe Avenue
Presented by Architect Piotr Dziejewski and Landscape Architect David Rose

Presentation
 - The proposal was revised as follows to improve site compatibility, yard integration and provide better privacy:
 - width of the building reduced by 4’ at the living room and master bedroom side
 - length of south porch shortened by 4’
 - depth of west porch reduced by 4’
 - north deck on second floor has been removed.
 - Changes to overall architectural appearance as follows:
 - Architectural style – Arts and Crafts with a Tudor flavour
 - Roof eaves set directly over main level with gable ends and dormers
 - The double-height area above family room reduced by the low eave lines.
 - Open up the back path completely to the backyard with previous planting & limited access.
 - Grades match with adjoining property.
 - Widened the planting strip at front yard.
 - Height of the retaining wall of the front has been amended (Max. 4ft high) as per the request of city planner. New walls will be installed to comply.

Questions

- Materials planned for the landscaping? Granite retaining walls, stone paving at the entry terrace and concrete paving elsewhere.
- Guardrail protection at exterior stairs and landings? Not required due to the surrounding landscaping design.
- Handrail design? A ‘minimalist’ approach, details to follow.
- Driveway width been reduced? No. Always been 10ft but relocated from the first inquiry.
- Material for the massive sloped roof? Duroid.
- Concrete on the patio? Observable from the driveway. Diminishing quality of the house.
- How do you turn the cars around? A maneuvering room of at least 22 feet in front of the garage. A “hammerhead” is also provided beside the driveway.
- Concrete paving is suitable for driveway not patio? Yes.
- Notes of the drawing – “solar energy pre-pipes”? Conduits installed for future implementation of solar panels.
- What is the nature of the “rough in” for solar energy?
- Height of the existing walls? Between 5 – 6 ft. Can you slope the grade backwards or keep it a steeper slope? Extending the slope back. Prefer to have a higher retaining wall. Planner to confirm if there is a requirement to lower the wall.
- Exposed concrete could be seen on the driveway wall below the grade. (A-05 & A-06). Is it the intention to have a concrete finished wall? No, to use stone.
- Reservation about how close the building is from the adjacent road even with the improved design of the access steps to the main entry. Client feels that the house location should not be pushed back towards the back of the property. Adjacent neighbors have written letters agreeing with the proposed rear yard setback of the proposed house for privacy issues. Instead of relocating the house, why not shorten its length instead?
- In order to increase the front yard setback, could the client consider reducing the length of the building by reducing the width of the family room/kitchen area and redesigning the bedroom directly above this by eliminating the double height feature? Not sure.
- House intended to live in or for sale? For sale.
- Color of the plaster? Issue not yet resolved.
- Owner’s comments –1.5 years spent so far on the approval process for this proposal for a generic looking Shaughnessy home. The shape and terrain of the property made it difficult to site the proposed home further from the adjacent road, maximize FSR and maintain a private backyard relationship with its neighbours.

Planning Comments to Panel

Planning believes that the roof and massing revisions are a move in the right direction. The Director of Planning asks for your comments with regard to the FSODP and Guidelines, and whether the changes have addressed the Panel's previous comments. Further, we ask for your comments on the height of the proposed stone retaining wall at the street. Note that we have not record of requesting a lower wall.

Comments

- House location on site is an improvement from the previous scheme. Advantage to approaching the house if the existing retaining wall maintained at 5 ft.
- Roof massing – needs to be simplified. Reconsider the use of Duroid roofing.
- Materials – needs a materials list. Clarify on your drawing about granite, exposed concrete...etc
- Exposed concrete - feels more massive. It will be a design decision to balance it out. Need to be more detailed.
- Width of the driveway seemed too narrow. Do something to make it wider
- The current design is much improved compared to the 1st and 2nd schemes although the house looks large for the site.
- Increasing the front yard setback will benefit the design.
- Consider keeping the existing 5-6 foot level of the retaining walls along the street.
- Softer landscaping approach – driveway long & uphill, integration with nature, better integration with driveway. Elongated pipe shape.
- Privacy at the back for family is validated. Don't mind fence to be 5-6 ft.
- Applicant to consider increasing the front yard setback without locating the home further back into the site. One option is to shorten the length of the proposed home. Reducing the width of the family room/kitchen area by 2-3' and redesigning the bedroom located directly above could be a solution. No need to push the building further into the back of the site. The resulting loss of the double-height space above the family room could be an advantage as the present proposal of this space is reminiscent of suburban developments. The larger bedroom in this redesign will recapture the FSR lost in the width reduction of the family room/kitchen area. The access stair to the main entry of the home
- An increase front yard setback will allow the access stair in front of the house to be located further from the street.
- Should rethink retaining wall along the driveway to lessen the constricting effect of the access. Consider an exposed aggregate finish instead of granite. Or introduce planting in front of or hanging over this wall.

- The granite retaining wall along the street should round into the driveway, perhaps at a lower height and integrate with the material proposed for the base of the house. The south retaining wall of the driveway should be of another material that complements with granite. Landscape features could be used to soften the sidewalls of this driveway.

SUMMARY

The Panel supports your home design and generally liked the proposal. There are concerns about the distance from the house to the road, the huge expanse of the Duroid roof & the usage of materials in the exterior walls. A material list should be included in the application. The panel also supports the high perimeter retaining wall to mirror what was there before.

CONCLUSION

Motion to move the enquiry to application with comments addressed. Seconded and carried.