

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

MINUTES from the meeting of March 17th, 2011, 4:45 p.m.
@ City Hall Business Centre, City Hall, 2nd Floor

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

Recording Secretary: David Cuan

AGENDA

Meet at Site: 3538 Cypress Street

New Business:

Address:	3538 Cypress Street
Inquirer:	Studio One Architecture Inc.
Description:	To consider an addition to an existing pre-1940's single family dwelling.
Status:	First Enquiry

Business:

1. Review of Minutes of February 24 & 3, 2011 and Jan. 13, 2011.
2. Projects Updates.
3. Other Business

Meet at Site: 4:00 pm.

3538 Cypress Street

Owner and Jim Wong of Studio One Architecture Inc. were on site to conduct the tour around the house exterior.

- The existing house is currently undergoing alterations to the front porch/stairs and replacement of existing exterior finishes including windows, wall cladding and floor decking.
- Proposed addition to the rear of the house (east) to create an additional bedroom/en-suite on the second floor, a new study/enlarged family room on the main floor and a new gymnasium/mechanical room in the basement.
- The proposed addition is located close to the adjoining property line but within the required building setback.
- An existing exterior stair located on the east side of the house was previously demolished. There is no plan to replace this in the new addition.
- The north side of the existing house overlooks mature vegetation on the northern tip of the site.

New Business, 4:45-5:30 pm:

3530 Cypress Street

Project presented by Natasha and Jim Wong of Studio One Architecture Inc. in the presence of the owner.

Architectural Presentation

- The current English Tudor revival styled house was built in 1908 and is in need of restoration.
- The property is currently undergoing an extensive building upgrade including:
 1. New granite base to give the house a tripartite architectural expression in keeping with the design guidelines of First Shaughnessy Official development Plan.
 2. A redesigned front porch and stone stairway facing Cypress Street.
 3. Alteration to the main floor plan to allow the expression of the north porch that was incorporated to the house walls in a previous renovation.
 4. Replacement/alteration of the structural support under the porches.
 5. Replacement of existing windows with paned wood windows, most are double-hung.
 6. New exterior stucco wall finish/ wood trims with rain-screen construction to the entire house.
 7. New cedar shakes roofing.
 8. Gutting the interior finishes of the house to make way for new finishes and fittings.
 9. Creation of new mechanical/electrical rooms in the basement to complement the existing.
- The anticipated development permit application is for a new building addition to the east side of the house to accommodate:
 1. A new Gymnasium and additional mechanical room located in the basement.

2. Extension to the Family Room and a new Study.
 3. An additional bedroom and en-suite on the second floor.
- The proposed addition is within the side yard setback from the eastern side of the property.
 - The existing house and proposed addition is located at the southern half of the entire property. The existing 2 car garage is wedged between the house and the south property line with a vehicular driveway access from Cypress Street due west.

Questions

- What is the resulting FSR with the proposed addition? Within FSR 0.45 for pre-1940's houses.
- Building setbacks? No rear yard setbacks required in the odd shaped property: The proposed addition is located within the side yard setback from the east property line.
- Site coverage? Within allowance.
- What is the new outdoor fireplace for? Outdoor barbecue serviced by the same chimney for the new indoor fireplace in the additional bedroom proposed.
- Access from house to garden located north of the property? No close access from the north and east part of the house. Access stairs located on the west and south sides of the house makes garden access circuitous.
- Could a new exterior access stair be provided for a more direct link between house and garden? Yes but this would incur additional floor space which exceeds the maximum FSR allowed.
- Could the new stair be located at the northeast corner of the house where the proposed eating porch is located? No, this would eliminate the amenity and also encroach on the proposed mechanical room below.
- Is there a requirement for 4 mechanical rooms (one existing and 3 new ones) in this house? Yes, due to complicated equipments and the number of units required to service the large home. Also, one room is dedicated only for electrical and another for condensers.
- Are the proposed crawlspaces around the house in compliance with the low ceilinged definition of these spaces? Yes. There will be a concrete floor slab and a clear height of 3.5 feet.
- Any planned work on the existing garage? None anticipated. May have to downsize garage if the proposed addition results in an FSR greater than 0.45.
- Could the roof pitch of the proposed building addition be redesigned to better complement the existing roof behind it? Difficult but will explore.
- Is there an arborist report on the existing trees and vegetation? No.
- Is there a landscape plan for this development? No. We just plan to retain the existing mature vegetation on site.

Planning Comments to Panel

- Planning has approved several minor permit applications on this property in the last two years, which included enclosing a sleeping porch on the second level, replacing the windows and modifying the front porch. The area policy supports the retention of pre-1940s home of architectural merit.
- The Director of Planning would like your comments on the proposed addition, specifically its proposed location and its relationship to existing building form and fenestration.

Comments from Panel

- The owner and architect are to be complemented on the high standards and quality of details for the house rehabilitation.
- Satisfied by the assurance that the proposed addition is within the required building setbacks and allowed maximum FSR of 0.45.
- There is some concern about the proposed roof pitch over the addition: Roof design should be improve to better complement the existing roof pitch/geometry. Perhaps the eaves of the proposed roof could be lowered to allow a steeper pitch to match existing.
- There should be a new exterior stair access to directly link the house and the north mature garden. This could be located northeast of the house to replace the proposed eating porch and lower mechanical room in the basement. Redesigning the front steps to also access the north part of the site directly should also be considered.
- Would like to see a landscape plan showing site developments around the house, especially in the areas close to the proposed outdoor barbecue/fireplace.
- The fenestration design in the proposed addition is fine.
- An arborist report assessing the existing trees for retention and a landscape plan showing any proposed hard and soft landscaping on the site should be submitted to the panel for review.
- Information on bylaw compliancy of the proposed project would have helped the panel members in our assessments.
- Would like to see the original floor plans of the house.
- There are too many mechanical rooms. Concerns about locating condensers in a basement mechanical room.

Summary

The panel praises the owner and architect for the high standards of finishes and architectural detail in the current alteration work. There is a major concern about the lack of meaningful link between the house and the mature garden located due north. The number of proposed large mechanical rooms is also another concern. The lack of an information list, an arborist report and a landscape plan for the project hampered its review at this stage.

Conclusion

Motion to have the proposal come back to FSADP as Development Permit application with comments addressed. Raised by David, Seconded by Judith; 6 favoured, 5 opposed; Motion passed.

Business, 5:30pm:

1. Review of Meeting Minutes:

1. Feb. 24, 2011 Minutes

- Item 1. Review of Minutes of Feb. 3rd, 2011: Delete clause "...as there are a few comments that need to be added by David Cuan for 1288 The Crescent".
- All supported the Motion to approve Minutes raised by Michelle.

2. Review of Feb. 3, 2011 Minutes:

- All supported the Motion to approve Minutes raised by David.

3. Review of Jan. 13, 2011 Minutes:

- All supported the Motion to approve Minutes raised by John.

2. Recent Project Update:

- No new applications or approvals since the last meeting. One new enquiry for the replacement of a post-1940s house.

3. Other Business:

Clarifications:

- Voting protocol for panel members:
 - Abstaining members will have their votes counted as favouring the tabled Motion.
 - Chair votes as a member of the panel.
- Development Permit:
 - All proposals for building additions in First Shaughnessy must go through the formal process of a Development Permit Application which includes a design review by FSADP.
- Neighbours notification:
 - Notification will be sent out to the immediate neighbours when a Development Permit application is made by the owner of a property.

Adjournment