

---

**First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel  
MINUTES  
February 24<sup>th</sup>, 2011 - 4:00 pm - 6:30 pm  
Committee Room No. 1, Main City Hall**

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

## **AGENDA**

### **Business:**

1. Review of Minutes of February 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2011
2. Project Updates
3. Other Business

### **New Business:**

1. Address: 1633 West King Edward Street  
Inquirer: Robert Chester Architect  
Status: DE 414488  
(Previous: Enquiry Sept 30<sup>th</sup>, 2010)
2. Address: 3490 Pine Crescent  
Inquirer: Stefan Wiedemann  
Status: First Enquiry

## **MEETING**

### **Business, 4:00pm - 4:15pm:**

1. Review of Minutes of Feb 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2011
  - Minutes are moved to next meetings Agenda as there are a few comments that need to be added by David Cuan for 1288 The Crescent
  - January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2011 Minutes Distributed by Ann McLean - to be discussed at next meeting

---

## 2. Projects Updates:

- 1526 W. 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue - DE 414288 Approved with Conditions
- 1518 Hosmer Avenue - DE 414340 Approved with Conditions
- 3389 Pine Crescent - DB Application - Field Review for Landscape
- Wilfred Ng has resigned.
- The City has posted the open position. If anyone knows a resident interested as a representative for First Shaughnessy, please encourage them to apply.
- Their term will end with the end of this Council.

3. Lisa MacIntosh had to leave early at 5:30pm.

4. Lori Kozub had to leave early at 6:00pm.

## **New Business**, 4:15pm - 6:00pm:

### **1. 1633 West King Edward Street**, 4:15pm - 5:15pm:

- Presentation: Robert Chester, Architect and Keith Koroluk, Landscape Architect

#### Robert Chester Architect

- Nothing has really been changed in this presentation from the first one
- Didn't make any changes and did not agree with the comments from the Panel.
- Didn't want to come back to the Design Panel and instead wanted the Directors of Planning's opinion and views on the matter. The scheme is designed for the requirements of the owners.
- Existing street access on King Edward Avenue. 3 car garage in the basement of the house. Long narrow lot.
- Don't want to make the building too long; but the originally proposed 50' wide building doesn't leave us much room to get a high pitched roof in so we had to make it more of an "L" shaped and have the upper portion of the roof at a shallower pitch with turrets at the corners to create interest.
- The design is still in flux, presented a new sketch of an alternate option showing a stone base, significant trims and decorative ironwork at windows, stone chimney, stone quoins at corners and stucco exterior finish.

#### Keith Koroluk Landscape Architect

- Presented a larger coloured landscape plan.
- Addressed the comments received from the panel at enquiry stage.
  1. Home is disconnected? Made a couple of changes from the step down and up patio, we removed the stepping and made it more of a level grade. The covered veranda is all on grade which helps to bring the garden into the house, no more step down. Not making space too big, covered portion on the veranda will have a kitchen, grill countertop, large open patio.
  2. Massing of the house is overwhelming: Prepared to increase pot size of planters from 2 to 5. Also increase the size of the trees and shrubs to frame view of the house. The proposed adjustments should increase landscape filtering and layering as viewed from the street.
  3. Push the garage off the lane: Accommodating garage within the building frees up the backyard and provides much better relationship with the house

- 
- and gardens. Added a strip and planting climbing vines on walls between the house and the neighbors. Start the planting right at the bottom of the wall.
4. Road blocks on the driveway will make house looking opposing on the street: Not really sure what was meant by this comment. No Roadblocks, sunken driveway, vehicle would be concealed from the street.
  5. Building mass: Propose a more lush landscaping and this should help reduce the impact from the street, have cedar hedging for the neighbors, corner elements create interesting element.
  6. Too much massing, about house and garden: Increase the size of the landscaped area.

**Questions:**

- On the plan the trees have large circles are these existing trees? Yes keeping as much of the original trees as much as possible. Tried to enclose the garden space by adding some more trees. Not removing any trees? Just one conifer and will be replacing with 2 trees at the entrance of the driveway.
- Please clarify what is different in your drawings this time from the last? Basically same scheme, the turret design has changed a bit; the front elevation has changed a bit, intention to develop the frames and the iron on the windows.
- What is happening on the west side? Decided to add a concrete retaining wall instead of having sloped soft landscape to reconcile the higher elevation of the backyard with the lower driveway. A low planter with shrubs to screen this wall. A metal guardrail is proposed on top of the retaining wall.
- Planter boxes under windows? Flower box design is still ongoing.
- How would the stone base in the front elevation shown in the sketch be carried out on all building elevations? Yes. We would have it go around the building. Any material strategy should be equivalent on all sides, including the quoins.
- Is the roof material culture stone? Imitation slate, we would use a material that would represent slate. Not using natural stone.
- Is this the exact same project as last time and did not make any changes? Yes, we have a bit of confusion as to what the proper procedure.
- Did you find the Panel comments unclear or you didn't know what to do with them? We had hoped for comments directly from the Director of Planning to supplement the feedback from the panel at the enquiry stage.
- Explain in more detail landscape on East side? Hedges complementing existing trees to screen site from neighbors and access on grade on this side to the rear yard with a semi-informal garden walkway is the basic intent.
- Describe some materials? Fencing? Haven't shown but probably wood painted

---

lattice screen. Streetscape? No fencing, low hedging 4 - 5 feet, to provide openness to the front of the house, shrubs in small medium create layering effect on ground cover on both sides, existing trees frame the house, semi formal treatment with Japanese maple curved boxwood border.

- What is the footprint of the house? Are you using all allowable? Your footprint hasn't changed since last time? No still the same. FSR is above grade.
- Main floor hasn't change? No still the same.

### **Planning Comments and Questions to the Panel:**

- The Panel saw this proposal as an Enquiry on September 30<sup>th</sup>, 2010 and recommended that it return as an Enquiry before a DE application was made.
- The recommendations at the September Panel meeting were to reconsider the "Chateau" style, consider placing a garage at the lane, and "a lot" of work on the design development.
- City staff forwarded comments separate from the Panel comments, though in general concurrence. The Director of Planning does not generally comment directly on enquiries of this scale, but through Staff.
- Have the revisions satisfied the Panels previous comments? The Director of Planning would like comments on the roof form, composition, fenestration, detailing and proposed materials.

### **Comments:**

- Appreciated improvements to the landscape design to address the Panel's comments at your last presentation.
- The architect had a number of different proposals earlier, some were "L" shaped which would have been more suitable for this long site.
- Not a 1<sup>st</sup> Shaughnessy home. The flower boxes under windows and double hung windows are improvements but these elements are not enough.
- Design needs to heed the design guidelines for First Shaughnessy.
- Very disappointed that you didn't take into consideration our previous comments and proposals; come back when they have been done
- Like to stress that comments from a FSADP review are meant to help improve the proposed development.
- Thank Landscape Architect for making necessary changes, increasing plant material like open of the rear and grade far better flow, detail in auto court is

---

appreciated, don't object to retaining wall instead of sloping wall, could reduce the height of the wall.

- Happy with retaining so many trees.
- There is one area of concern rear lower patio with the step pertaining to the safety issue of the wall what's going to be planted in the lower level so that it's not a safety issue: use landscaping as barrier instead of a metal railing.
- Disappointed with Architect, basically nothing new to comment on. The earlier comments from the Sept 30<sup>th</sup>, 2010 Meeting Minutes need s to be reviewed and considered. Chateau style can work in Shaughnessy building configuration and massing.
- About the use of authentic materials, "Roof Rock" has been approved for some projects in First Shaughnessy.
- Completely agree with previous comment, think you should work on the chateau idea. Work on more of a town feeling instead of a country feeling, it would signal a very interesting design direction for developments along King Edward.
- Have an opportunity to build something interesting and you will get there no problem.
- Do think what's been done with the landscaping has integrated the house with the gardens which is the objective. Integration has started and on grade treatment of the patio is softening.
- Bring samples and colors and materials. Agree with the sizing up of the plants.
- Agree with what's happening with the landscaping,
- Disappointed that the house hasn't been changed, would like the comments of Sept 30<sup>th</sup> 2010 reviewed and the comments considered.
- It is understood that in First Shaughnessy you cannot just tear down and build whatever you want. Encouraged that the landscaping had been changed. It can be difficult for architect to tell owner what has to be done. Use the ODP as a guideline is for using authentic materials.
- Like what the landscape is doing with the screening of the house.
- Shared previous comments about the roof: A big mansard style roof with satellite turrets not attractive. Suggests a fundamentally change in the house plans and shape to significantly alter the geometry of the roofs. Cannot make any comments on the materials as none were presented.
- Needs a lot of work, the basis of the design is French Chateau but its not there

---

yet. Sorry that you did not see fit to make any changes from the last meeting.

- Disappointed that comments were not considered from the last meeting.
- With the deep lot, a separate garage at the backyard instead of parking under the building may be better. Take advantage of siting.
- Screening, along King Edward. Some residents use huge cedar trees for screening instead of having an open frame.
- Like the movement of going to more stone work. Most of the comments have to do with elevation. Not fond of the imitation stone. Challenge you on the stone stucco, and wood, how all these different elements work together. Weak double column elements on the front. The west elevation design looks too random. Do not object to the Chateau approach.

**Comments Summary:**

- Well thought out changes to the landscape
- Panel was very disappointed on the architectural side
- The design and concept has to be well thought out based on the Panel feedback
- Architect is required to understand how the FSD review process works
- Architect needs to read the FSODP completely and then you'll understand how the Panel comments relate to the FSODP
- Refer to all comments from the Minutes of September 30, 2010 because they are all still relevant. Also include comments from today.
- After going through the points I have mentioned, you need to put pen to paper and start to design a home that fits within First Shaughnessy.
- There are a few positive comments on developing a more urban French town feeling design.

**MOTION:**

To have the applicant come back as a DE with all comments addressed. This includes a full presentation with a model and material samples. Motion moved by David, seconded by Lu; All Approved.

---

## 2. 3490 Pine Crescent, 5:00pm - 6:00pm:

Presentation: John Minty, Landscape, Stefan Wiedemann Architect

Stefan Wiedemann, Architect

- Site does slope heavily from front to back
- Current building is nondescript. There is a shared driveway with the neighbors which they are legally splitting the driveway, maintaining the original curve cut shared entry, coming up with 16 foot driveway
- Shortening the driveway turning auto court into 4 car garage, wanted to separate the entry way.
- Creating an anti-room when you come off the sidewalk you come through the garden to the front door.
- Formal living and dining areas will have a view, back yard is informal.
- Turned building more centre, modeled on a Chateau scheme, stone granite base, indoor pool rec room come forward,
- The actual building is set back form, change of material to show separation, brought roof down, surrounds on all the windows and doors
- Limestone and stucco on overall massing of building
- Roof is brought together with dormers, black slate for the roof to match neighbor, using complimentary materials building itself in terms of landscape
- Trying to create a series of outside rooms with patios interconnecting, all wood with true light, guttering will be zinc,

John Minty, Landscape

- Fair amount of hard landscape with concrete through the garden, main courtyard with a water feature, outdoor fireplace, more of a naturalistic approach.
- Trying to work with minimizing the concrete work, lots of space, natural stone steps, mid to low range shrubs and trees and planting  
Not really epic Shaughnessy landscaping because of the view, with a fair amount of commitment to lawn.

### Questions

- Pedestrian paths at front of the house and adjacent landscaping at the same level? There is a subtle slope down to window wells.
- Front of house has moved closer? Yes the house is closer than current.
- Currently hedge across the front perimeter are you planning on retaining the hedge? Yes along with the wall.
- You're actually coming out from the rest of your neighbors? Not really because if you run alongside its pretty much all the same. Do comply with the setback.
- 4 car garage? Would client consider 2 underground and 2 in rear yard? The

---

issue is the grade; to set it up close you would be seeing the garage from the streetscape

- What is the elevation of the existing house? Higher than what is currently proposed, we are coming down in about 8 feet because it is located lower on the slope and closer to the front property line. Material list asphalt shingle for the roof? Currently discussing with client and would like to slate. Acrylic Stucco? Wanted a smooth face.
- Window materials aluminum? Not going to happen.
- Describe the origin of the idea? Unification of windows is a big feature, explain the architecture to us. Looked at a lot of chateaus from France and thought could create a little bit of a different front door. Wanted it read as being different from the sides.
- What's the reason for drive way situation? The owner wants security; the neighbors are currently parking in the back.
- Left neighbor has an abandoned walkway? That's the access for this site and will be closing that entry will be redoing it all to make it more in line with the main driveway so that it is noticeably the same property.
- The design guidelines require the home to integrate with the neighbors, obvious difference in massing. How do you see it fitting in? The massing is significantly smaller than the building on the left; two buildings do read with each other, essentially same type of materials being used, we fall into the middle.
- Setback? Yes a little forward. House looks bigger in massing than the neighbors, the heights match up width is wider, middle lot is smaller in order to achieve backyard personal space we had to move the house a little further forward. Outline on front edge is not the front façade, it is the footprint of the plinth/terrace. Needs to have a line drawn and shading filled in.
- Existing trees? Onsite there is nothing on the site that would have any desire to keep other than a small magnolia and dogwood. Only other thing is the huge holly hedge in the front the back has nothing other than sharing the hedge with the back neighbor. One is an old fruit plum tree and maybe an old Japanese maple that may be kept. Old sick trees, its all paved no greener on the site. Whole site is paved.
- Desire to share the driveway as is from environmental issue? The primary issue is that the parking is accessed at different grading. New driveway design will be hard to share.
- Set of dimensions is that the height of the peak of the roof? How does it relate to max allowed? The allowed building height is 35 feet. The difference of 7 inches as shown will be adjusted to suit the requirement of planning.

- 
- Director of Planning might still allow because of the grading of the land. Might not be an issue. Building elevation is lower by 8 feet.
  - FSR? Close to the max. 1 square foot extra.

### **Planning Comments and Questions to the Panel:**

- This is an enquiry for a new single family dwelling. Our records indicate that the house on the site dates from before 1940. However staff have reviewed this and decided that it no longer has the architectural merit noted in the Guidelines to support retention.
- The Director of Planning asks for your comments with regard to the FSODP and Guidelines, and specific comments on the siting of the house, the pedestrian and vehicular access.

### **Comments:**

- Thank you for enquiry. Chateau style popular recently in the neighborhood.
- Refine style and take comments to what is true French and design something clean and crisp
- Find the fenestration design jarring, perhaps it just a matter of alignment.
- Massing does seem very large, a little busy,
- Siting is not bad, driveway solution is reasonable, grade issues, what your doing is good, removing impervious paving of the existing tennis court, in terms of pedestrian access.
- Not convinced on the proposed pedestrian access to the house from the street level.
- Needs to be some integration between the landscaping and the house. The proposed landscaping is a bit soft and for chateau style you could push a little bit more into formalization.
- Looking for specific grade information at next presentation.
- Make sure that the grades are adjacent to neighbors.
- Really think about slate roof would like to say that drifting down to asphalt is not good
- Show your client how it looks. Use Roof Rock.
- Complicated design , bit exhausting,

- 
- Design needs to be more subtle, more simple,
  - Have trouble with the front entrance and door and its relationship to the street level as it is shielded from view. One aspect of neighbourliness is a visual link between the main door of the house with the passerby along the street.
  - Don't spend a lot of effort on hiding the house; Director of Planning may require it to be visible.
  - At next presentation, provide more accurate shadow lines at the drawings of building elevations to clearly depict the volumes of the proposed house. Some of the current shading is misleading.
  - Bring color palette proposed for the development. The choice of the black for the slate roof may be overpowering.
  - The retaining wall is quite high additional planting of hedging in the front of the house.
  - Building will not be seen from the street.
  - The proposed imposing house has nice features but needs refinement. Make sure your client has the financial commitment make this a high quality development and create a beautiful estate. Like the flat stucco.
  - Like idea of height reduction, removal of tennis court and more garden.
  - Would like to see less paving and more garden too many concrete decks.
  - Just a little too complicated. Given city situation a simpler design may be called for.

#### **Comments Summary:**

- Chateau style is a direction that shows promise,
- We would like to see refinement of the architectural elements to suit the neighborhood.
- The overall design seems complicated; we recommend a simplification of the fenestration details and a decrease in the overall mass of the house, specially viewed from the front.
- Issues relating to neighborliness remain as the proposed house will be much larger than its neighbors and the current site plan shows a pedestrian access to the site that obscures the main entry of the house as viewed from the street level.
- We are pleased that a slate roof is proposed but until a color scheme of the house and sample materials are presented, there is a question whether a black

---

slate roof will enhance the look of the house.

- As an alternate to a slate roof, you may consider "Roof Rock", a synthetic roofing material, for its range of colors.
- We are pleased that the applicant plans to incorporate energy efficient measures into the proposed development, including geothermal as an energy source.
- There needs to be more integration between the soft and hard landscaping, in particular how the meandering pedestrian walkway at the front of the house relates to the adjacent landscapes.
- Information on building grades around the house and gate details are expected at the next review.

**MOTION:**

Lu moved Motion to have the proposal proceed to the Development Permit stage with comments addressed. Seconded by John; Motion failed, 2 for and 6 against.

Victor moved Motion to have the proposal come back to the panel as 2<sup>nd</sup> enquiry with comments addressed. Seconded by Phil; Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 6:40pm. Next meeting at March 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011.