

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

MINUTES from the meeting of October 21, 2010, 4:00 pm

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

AGENDA

- Business:
1. Review of Minutes of September 9, 2010
Review of Minutes September 30, 2010
 2. Recent Projects Updates.
- New Business:
1. Address: 1426 Angus Drive
Inquirer: Formwerks Architectural
Status: DE 414093
 2. Address: 1052 Wolfe Avenue
Inquirer: Loy Leyland Architect
Status: DE 414253
 3. Address: 1965 Mathews Avenue
Inquirer: Jonathan Katz Architect
Status: First Enquiry

Business, 4:00 – 4:30pm:

1. Review of September 9 & 30 Minutes:
 - Review of Minutes of September 9, 2010
Moved, Seconded - Passed
 - Review of Minutes September 30, 2010
 - Moved, Seconded – Passed
2. Recent Projects Update:
 - 3389 Cypress Street – DE Application
3. Underground wiring at The Crescent – The extent of the City Engineering involvement is to select pole mounted or ground mounted (LPT) transformers. This is a BC Hydro issue. SHPOA has been in communication with BC Hydro.
4. 3212 East Boulevard – Development Application proposing a multi unit dwelling and tearing down a pre 1940's home. Proposal is adjacent to First Shaughnessy District and is causing concern with residents regarding the density. The Director of Planning advises that the FSADP may comment as a neighbour, but will not review the proposal as it is not in FSD.

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

1. 1426 Angus Drive
Presented by Formwerks Architectural (Landscape Plan not included in package)

Presentation

- Minor modification to existing house – taking off carport
- Infill house at the back is designed in character of the main house
- Improving the covered porch, replacing with more wood structure
- Adding terraces and replacing the existing pond
- There will be a hot tub, outdoor fireplace & a pool
- Will be maintaining a lot of existing trees
- Will be keeping the hedge row for privacy

Questions

- Is the garage door a roll up? Yes
- Distance between end of the pave entertainment area & the patio of the proposed infill? About 8 ft.
- Have you talked to neighbors behind? No. Retention of hedge row will not cause any issue.
- Is the Infill setback? Yes, by 4.92m.

- Number of trees removed? 3 at back, 3 at the side and 1 on Angus Street
- Is the house accommodated for fire truck access? Yes
- Why is the coach house so close to the proposed house? For guest purposes.
- Different material can be used for the driveway? Could do
- Reduce the width of the driveway? Will check into that.
- Carport considered attached? Yes
- Narrower driveway to avoid taking off street tree? No.
- Arborist recommends cutting the tree on Angus Street? Yes
- Front door kept intact? Some design around to enhance quality.

Planning Comments

The Panel generally supported this proposal in its preliminary enquiry. A relaxation is required to place the garage in the location of the existing carport.

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 siting of the infill and its outdoor space;
- the form and detailing of the infill;
- the fire truck access and
- the treatment of additions to the principle dwelling.

Comments

- Like the Roofline, taking our old elements, like the dormers
- Appreciate taking our the 1950 elements
- Infill house & current house too close together
- Roof alignment for garage needs further work
- Require more brick work and stucco to bring to a quality finish.
- Needs more consideration from the west by adding more brick component,
- Entertainment area with the patio of the infill house feels too tight
- Find the outdoor spaces too close to the infill house
- Reduce the visual impact of the driveway by reducing width
- Increasing planting space between downstairs access
- Infill has no space – the main house had 5 outdoor sitting areas, and too close to the house
- Relationship between the 2 homes need a lot more work
- Need to add brick to the main house to improve the quality of the house
- Too many large outdoor areas – reducing some to strengthen relationship of the 2 homes, more brick materials would be nice, roof plan needs more work.
- Infill with the trees too cramped, no outdoor space
- Master bedroom in the infill too close to the main house

Summary:

The plan has too much hard space in the back yard.

Require a better relationship between the main house and the infill.

Garage requires more work regarding the roofline.

Motion: See Project back for a second time with comments addressed & with landscaping plans.

Seconded, Approved.

2. 1052 Wolfe Avenue
Presented by Loy Leyland Architect,

Presentation

- Changed significantly from its previous application, addressed all previous comments,
- House to the south setback
- Changes to the windows
- Parking reduced
- East wall increased
- Planting didn't changed

Questions

- Landscape plan & architectural plan is different
- Driveway walls? Will be granite & keeping it as low as it can
- Integrate some kind of lightning on the south? Yes

Planning Comments

We have seen this proposal on three previous occasions, and the Panel is familiar with the challenges of this site. The Director of Planning asks for your comments with regard to the FSODP and Guidelines, and on whether the application addresses your prior comments.

Comments

- Quality of the house should be up to Shaughnessy standards
- Roof quality of the house - materials
- In favor of landscape plan, 12ft span of plain concrete is stark,
- Granite pillars are good and the pavement towards entrance near driveway has improved significantly
- Existing retaining wall height retained but need to be more strongly connected to the garden
- Main entry stairs is concrete rather than stone, some suggest that stone is better

- A well conceived project - small house with the opportunity to be robust if finished with quality materials.
- South driveway retaining wall – adding cap to the east elevations, staged up pattern with 2 inch reveal line needs more texture
- Relaxation on gate height, sweep up to connect to the wall

Summary

All the feedback addresses previous concerns. Suggest plants & trees are more robust. Ensure the quality of the finishing's of the home meets the standards of Shaughnessy and the ODP.

Note from Chair: The color scheme should be reconsidered because it is the identical color scheme with a home the builder built one block away.

Motion:

Support the Application with comments addressed

Seconded, Approved

3. 1965 Matthews Avenue

Presented by Jonathan Katz Architect, No landscape architect

Presentation

- Rather than tearing down house the owners are keen to renovate
- Garage to stay in current location
- Replacing all the windows
- Swimming pool plan on the back of the lot
- Existing driveway leading to the new garage
- Existing roof plan unchanged, not be imposing

Questions

- More about materials? Replace with wood windows, cedar shape roof, add detail to the railings and front porch,
- More about the porch? Extension of the dining room, big French doors to the side of the house
- Pre-existing non-conforming? Yes
- Porch – skylights? Yes, but there is a fair amount of screening from the house
- Wood siding is the current exterior? Yes
- Explain existing elevation line & proposed elevation line? Slopes from east to west, originally wanted pool in front yard, now rear yard, front yard landscape without changing existing elevation,
- Landscaping plan? Not yet
- Consideration of removing existing skylight? Skylight useful, adds light.
- New east elevation? Raised the grade to the east for swimming pool? Grade is remained the same.no adjustment

Planning Comments

Staff reviewed an earlier enquiry of this proposal that examined several driveway and garage locations. This arrangement was the supportable with regards to retaining existing streetscape, reducing impermeable materials, and retaining existing landscape. Note that the garage area cannot be excluded from FSR in this case, as the garage doors are visible from the street.

The Director of Planning asks for your comments on this renovation with regard to the ODP and Guidelines with particular regard to the location and access to parking and the topographical treatment of the front yard.

Comments

- No objection to propose garage since its non conforming
- Reasonable to add garage to existing house due to nonconformity
- Need to work on the skylight situation. Skylights facing street not approved for Shaughnessy ODP. It doesn't fit with the house aesthetically
- Liked the improvements on the existing house but needs a more visible front entrance
- In favor of the wood windows
- Suggest materials be changed for the exterior of home to stucco and brick
- Need the development of landscaping plan
- Site plan – overall looks good, connection from garage to the patio, front elevation treatment
- Need to add more windows on 2nd floor for visibility
- Need to get neighbor's letter for supporting
- Issue of the front door – needs more definition
- Swimming pool should go to the back,
- Need more effort to reflect the house to earlier era – skylights, front door – defining where it is by maximizing fluidity,

Summary: The Panel supports garage, extend roofline. The home needs to be in compliance with FSD Guidelines - skylights don't work within that and detracts from the home design. This all needs to be reconsidered, and we need to review landscape plan

Motion: Support enquiry for DE application with comments addressed & with landscaping plans.

Seconded, Approved.