

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

MINUTES from the meeting of September 9, 2010, 4:00 pm

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

AGENDA

- Business:
1. Review of Minutes of August 19th , 2010
 2. Recent Projects Updates.

- New Business:
1. Address: 1288 The Crescent
Inquirer: Loy Leyland Architect
Status: Fourth Enquiry

Business, 4:00 – 4:30pm:

1. Review of August 19th Minutes:
 - No comments or corrections.
2. Recent Projects Update:
 - 1426 Angus Drive – New DE.
 - 3538 Cypress Street (at Cedar Cres):

-The project did not go through FSADP review as a number of small, Guideline-compliant revisions were proposed. The discussion with Planning started regarding enclosing an upper floor balcony and replacing the existing windows with new wood windows. (Note the enclosed balcony was work without permit). Planning supported this proposal. The next proposal involved

replacing the front access stair, extending the porch, and installing a stone base. Planning also supported these revisions. An interior alteration was done with a building permit. Interior Alterations do not require Planning review.

-Exterior photos of the ongoing renovation were circulated to the panel members. The Panel is concerned that developers/homeowners may use the process of progressive increase in project scope to avoid the scrutiny of the FSADP.

- Panel members request to have all future projects that affects street view submitted to the FSADP for review.

3. John Keen – abstain from comments and voting on 1288 The Crescent due to a conflict of interest.

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

1. 1288 The Crescent
Presented by Loy Leyland, Architect and Donna Chomichuk Landscape Architect

Presentation

- Existing house on site not yet demolished for fear of homeless people invading.
- Traditional motif of the proposed home fits the character of the area
- New site plan with increased side yard setbacks allows retention of the existing trees and this also makes for a more compact footprint.
- Drawings presented addressed all building elevations. Thoughts given to open area on the back.
- Large roofline lowered – lower than the neighbouring homes.
- Front – modified to be more low key and elegant.
- Overall landscaping remains same with bigger water feature added, more built -in planters at the terrace and modified terrace design to complement the adjacent garden. Provide a small garden area for children.

Questions

- Pedestrian walkway – off axis.
- Any relaxation? Height issue – the site drops 6ft from front to back so the applicant is asking for height relaxation for the proposed roof ridge between the turrets.
- What is the proposed site coverage? The project data table did not have the information but the architect assured that the proposal will meet the requirements. Underground garage – counts as part of basement or above grade? Definition of basement in regards to how it affects FSR.
- Explain the children’s garden – planting 12 - 15 hedge for privacy, included a playhouse

- Any height relaxation request for the main roof ? No, the proposed home is lower than its neighbours.
- Is the space under the terrace/deck at the back of the proposed home counted as basement? Yes.
- Is the car parking under the terrace counted in the FSR? Yes.
- Is the cupola at the terrace included in the FSR? No.
- Explain the east elevation – the driveway side, entrance to the garage way below grade? Appearance to the neighbours? Not an issue, as this low level entry is not prominent.

Planning Comments to the Panel

This proposal has covered a lot of ground in previous enquiries including the consideration for retention of the existing building on site. The Panel did not conclusively decide that the existing home had merit, and others felt that the retention efforts were not neighbourly in the re-siting of the existing building. The Director of Planning then concluded that the existing home need not be retained.

The Panel then viewed a number of proposed east and south elevations for the new home, along with a landscape plan. The Panel did support a height relaxation for the southeast tower. A full ridge cannot have the height relaxed.

The review summary of the last meeting asked that a single set of plans and elevations be developed for review and comment. There was some concern regarding the mass of the house.

The Director of Planning asks for your comments on this proposal with regard to the FSODP and Guidelines, and with specific regard to the proposed roof form, and its effect in creating an estate-like appearance.

Comments from the Panel

- Does not fit in the FS estate like guidelines, massing should not overwhelm the site, technical review should be thorough to ensure that the FSR and site coverage are within the bylaw regulations. All proposed building materials need to be outlined at the next presentation.
- The proposed house aesthetic looks like an unresolved mix of French Chateau and Shingles styles.
- The U-shape driveway at the front of the house is diminished by the proposed driveway running along the side of the house to access the car garage. The side driveway should be de-emphasized.
- The proposed landscaping lack coherence: the various parts of the flowering gardens/lawn area/children garden does not relate to one another. The children's garden feels separated from the lawn area. The house massing is overwhelming making the garden feels like an afterthought.

- Driveway side of the house looks French, relaxation the full ridge seems too extensive, rear terraces – lightwell to the pool; the rear patio spaces seems disconnected to the adjacent garden.
- Find the whole building too massive, with the massing on one side too dominating. This does not fit in with the street landscaping of the existing First Shaughnessy.
- East side – too many driveways, ridge doesn't work with the house, lose estate like qualities with the sense of space,
- Definition of the basement and FSR calculation for the site must be clarified. By the definition of “Basement”, the proposed lower level development including the indoor pool, car garage and studio located at the back of the main house may have to be treated as a “Main Floor” with the attendant allocation of its FSR as part of the above ground area calculation. Note that there are multiple direct accesses into this level, one directly from the rear lawn, another from at grade along the east property line. There is also a large “light-well” to illuminate the indoor pool.
- The proposed “deck” over the lower level indoor pool is approximately 6' off the adjacent finish grades. The visual effect of the proposed massive development is akin to a large ship stranded on site.
- The imposing building mass is a result of a liberal use of “double-height” spaces on the main floor that are exempt from double-counting for the FSR calculations.
- A lot of effort to consolidate the opinions of the panel, scale – looks bigger and lack of finer elements, more detailed treatment, east elevation is weakest of all, effort in compensating the massive building with a more ecological approach.
- Do not support the relaxation requested for the roof ridge between the 2 turrets.
- The site plan presented on March 23rd is more appropriate for the site.
- Ensure that the existing neighbouring infill house is not adversely affected by the proposed development on the site.

Summary

There are concerns about how the proposed development on the site impacts on its neighbours and the over-all estate-like character of First Shaughnessy. The following issues should be addressed by the designers in the next presentation:

1. FSR calculations,
2. proposed exterior elevations/building style,
3. access road along the east side of the house marginalizing the circle loop at the front of the house,
4. pedestrian access to the site,
5. coherence of the landscaping,
6. height of the proposed ridge connecting the front and rear turrets of the eastern elevations, and

7. terrace design to improve its relationship with the adjacent landscaping.

MOTION

Support to come back as enquiry with the comments addressed. Carried.

Meeting adjourned.