

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

MINUTES from the meeting of September 30, 2010, 4:00 pm

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

AGENDA

- Business:
1. Minutes of September 9, 2010
 2. Recent Projects Updates.
- New Business:
1. Address: 1633 West King Edward Avenue
Inquirer: Robert Chester Architect
Status: First Enquiry

Business, 4:00 – 4:30pm:

1. September 9 Minutes not available for review.
2. Recent Projects Update:
 - No Project Updates
3. Engineering Department – Under grounding of Electrical Wires at Crescent.
4. Welcome new member – Linda Collins Resident - Member at Large.

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

1. 1633 West King Edward Avenue
Presented by Robert Chester Architect, Keith Koroluk Landscape Architect
First Enquiry

Presentation

- Proposed to maintain existing residential streetscape
- Well-landscaped setting for the front yard with a degree of privacy
- Preserve existing trees on the front boulevard, mature magnolia trees and shrubs in the front yard
- A seating height planter on the west side yard is provided at the lower level to soften terraced retaining wall
- New lattice screen fencing and trellis/arbours with climbing vines is proposed to soften the auto court and screen the neighbour
- Landscape planting on the east side to soften appearance of the terraced retaining wall
- A garden courtyard is provided as an outdoor room and an extension of the covered veranda and the main floor living space
- 15 foot side yard, 3 car garage, 2 storey high building with 35 ft limit.
- L-shape rooftop reduces span of the roof with low pitch and high pitch roofs. Alternative roofs design available.
- Design worked within ODP guidelines
- Architectural intention – desirable to give some vertical feel through front elevations and corner elements,
- Depressed sunken patio for accessibility
- Existing tree proposed to be removed - 2 honey locust tree proposed to replace
- Proposed cedar hedging at the back

Questions

- Is there a plan of the Alternate C roof? No.
- Alternate A plan with no floor plans? No.
- Parking space at the back? Use for yard maintenance.
- Just the parking you are proposing extension?
- 9ft 2nd floor? Yes
- Parking on street access? Front access driveway with character of the area you can keep it.
- Sitting room with open ceiling is it a design? Feature of the house.
- Driveway wall on west side how high is the wall? 8-9 ft. Planting and climbing vine to cover the concrete wall. Climbing vines to screen wall.
- Would you like a relaxation? No. Lower ridge roof is compromised and will express the roof better. The steeper pitch roof is better.
- Parking underground on King Ed.? Hasn't been one with parking below.

Planning Comments to Panel:

The Director of Planning asks the Panel for comments on this proposal with regard to:

- Roof form and its effect in creating an estate-like appearance;
- Building form;
- Parking access; and
- the FSODP and Guidelines, and with specific regard to the proposed roof form.

Comments

- Building look quite tall with the narrowness of the roof.
- Alternate A offer better roof settings and is more traditional.
- More opportunity to be more in character of Shaughnessy. Needs more development, no tripartite expression.
- Home is disconnected
- Material aspect will add the richness in terms of the details and the layering of the tripartite expression
- Massing is overwhelming. The building is generous in terms of the property. Needs to be reduced
- Agree to push garage off the lane. There is concern about underground garage and lack of ability to provide screening to the street. Underground is related to bigger property lots.
- Too much planting on ground cover and not much layering.
- The building feels disconnected from the property and only connects to the front.
- One patio gives the notion that spaces are tucked up or sitting higher due to the light well.
- More exploration is needed.
- Consider design to be less “Chateau looking”. This design is too imposing on the street.
- Consider other design concepts that fit better on that street.
- Road blocks on the driveway will make the House look imposing on the street. The design gives a sophisticated city feel but not in Shaughnessy style.
- Building mass is quite large which give concern to the neighbors. Form is massive at the sides. Consideration is needed to reduce the impact. Perhaps Alternate A or C is more suited.
- Square mass does not add to verticality of the house. Changing pitches of the roof will address further articulation to the footprint.
- Building is disconnected. Reorganize grading is needed to make the design flow more comfortably.
- Too much massing and too disconnected. Shaughnessy is about house and garden. This is all house. Give landscape more room to do the gardening.

SUMMARY: This project needs a lot more development. Consider other designs than the chateau concept. You require more integration into the street. Consider the garage to be at the back instead of underground. Landscape design needs much more work including layering. Please review the comments included in our summary.

MOTION: Support to come back as second Enquiry with comments addressed
Carried.

2. 1819 Hosmer Avenue

Presented by Nancy Boulton, Owner and Cameron Owen, IBI Group

2nd Enquiry

Presentation

- Maintaining existing access.
- Proposing a new hedge 6 ft tall in association with 5ft tall black metal fence.
- Driveway extends all the way. Remove driveway at the back for additional parking space.
- Yew hedge on the front.
- Various stone work in the back and side of home
- Separate small gardens are around the edge of the home
- Parking spot in back
- Windows proposed as steel (with example brought to Panel)

Question

- Is this strata lot? Yes.
- In regard to steel frame windows. Outside frame all the same. Yes
- Can you describe main entrance? Walk in through gate to the front door.
- Front door visible? No. More ability for visual connection than existing front door.
- What is the rationale in replacing the holly hedge? It is thin in the bottom with chainlink fence visible at the bottom.

Planning Comments to Panel:

The Director of Planning asks for the Panel's comments with regard to the proposed

- Steel windows and
- Landscape design.

Comments

- Proposed windows are beautiful. They are not precedent setting.
- High quality windows
- Windows are elegant, and very historical
- Nice renovation.

- Landscape plan – changing the hedge material will have impact of the sense of the property being one estate .
- Needs to be in coordination with the main house.
- Consider changing location of the pedestrian gate.
- Landscape – turning inwards. Entrance spine of the building, move down giving more defined private space, approach driveway to the front door. Too many segments in landscaping, need to embrace the bigger estate-like manner

MOTION: Support Enquiry with comments addressed.

Carried.

3. Underground wiring at The Crescent
Presented by Ann McLean

- BC Hydro is replacing existing metal poles with wood poles for maintenance reasons.
- Due to the shape of the Crescent, the wood poles require many anchor wires. For safety and appearance reasons, underground wiring would be preferable here.
- Undergrounding the wires will require 2-3 low profile transformers (LPT)-2ft high, 3x3- around The Crescent .
- The LPTs may have some landscaping on two sides.
- These will be placed on City property either on the park side (centre) or adjacent to the sidewalk and private property.
- Properties that receive overhead power from the lines on The Crescent will need to have a post placed near the front property line to transfer the power lines from underground to the overhead receiving point on the house.

Engineering would like the Panel's comments on whether the underground approach is preferable to overhead, and where the low profile transformers are best located.

Questions

- Preferable? Yes.
- Transformer placed on City property? Yes
- Underground Vault rather than LPT? Per Phil Yacht, not supported by BC Hydro
- Need more information, a guide to speak about the issue.

SUMMARY: Need someone from BC Hydro or City Engineering to describe the issues and alternatives?