

## First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

MINUTES from the meeting of April 20, 2011, 4:00 pm



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

### AGENDA

- Business:
1. Review of Minutes of March 17, 2011.
  2. Recent Projects Update
  3. Other Business
- New Business:
1. Address: 3490 Pine Crescent  
Inquirer: Stefan Wiedemann Architect  
Status: Second Enquiry (Previous Feb 24/11)
  2. Address: 3490 Cypress Street  
Inquirer: Rob Johnson, MAIBC  
Status: First Enquiry
  3. Address: 3660 East Boulevard  
Inquirer: Andrew Cheung Architects  
Status: First Enquiry
  4. Address: 1518 Laurier Avenue  
Inquirer: Raffaele & Associates  
Status: First Enquiry

## MEETING:

**Business, 4:00 - 4:30 pm:**

1. Review of March 17, 2011 Minutes:
  - Check address for typo: 3538 Cypress?
  - Add to comments from Phil Yacht re: 3538 Cypress:
    - The mechanical rooms around the perimeter of the house seem to be excessive and that we would like to see the mechanical engineer's report certifying that the area is essential to enclose all of the machinery necessary for the heating and air conditioning of the house. FYI about 15 watts per sq ft is typical unless they require meat locker refrigeration temperatures in the summer.
    - A stairway at the back of the house is included in the FSR calculation. Because there is no access to the garden, I asked for the Director of Planning to allow a relaxation so that the access would not have to be done illegally a year later.

MOTION to approve minutes. Seconded. Approved

2. Recent Projects
  - 1565 Matthews DE 414571- has come in as an application. Was seen by the Panel during Enquiry. There was general support of the proposal and the Panel's previous comments will be incorporated into the review.
  - 1633 W King Edward – the decision date has passed for this application. The permit was neither refused, nor approved. A letter with conditions for approval was sent which requested revised drawings and a model reflecting revisions.
3. Panel members: Lu Tang stepping down at end of April. Also, this is Michelle McMaster's last meeting. Jennifer Stamp welcomed to panel as BCSLA representative replacing Michelle McMaster. Thank you to Michelle McMaster and Lu Tang for their commitment and efforts

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

1. **3490 Pine Crescent**  
Presentation of changes made since last visit to panel:  
Stefan Wiedemann, architect:
  - Massing relative to street unclear: More information added to site plan to differentiate main/upper floors wall location from basement level wall 'plinth'. The main and second story's are in line with adjacent house to east.
  - Simplified and clarified form to become consistent throughout all facades:
    - windows and doors;
    - eyebrow dormer removed from roof

- roof plan, deemed too complex, simplified with change in pitch to reduce mass. Overall form is hip.
- City requested change to create hierarchy of massing: south side of front patio ‘plinth’ has been moved towards rear by 3’. Resulted in removal of one of garages, and relocation of one car garage to face south, at right angles to others
- Materials for roofing, sample passed: ‘Symphony’ by CertainTeed, a recycled composite faux-slate material. This product has ridged back support.

John Minty, landscape designer:

- Landscape drawings don’t reflect latest change to building (to ‘plinth’ as noted above).
- Landscape loose with formal house. Graphics revised to make concept clearer.
- Grades on architectural site plan.
- Patio spaces loosened up: 2 major patios in front central patio in rear are paved with open materials (gravel ?); kitchen and family room patios in rear to be primary use spaces;
- front entrance access a hierarchy of solid paved space for primary walk and flagstone for secondary paths off this walk
- stairs marked by planters to help direct users to the front door
- new formal driveway and entry only
- Brohm basalt for paving, drystack walls and stone faced concrete walls.

Questions:

- Materials? Colours? Muted, tending towards ‘limestone’ colours. Stucco with flat matt finish. Zinc gutters and downspouts; stone on house to be from main floor down (basement level, wherever exposed)
- Are there doors missing from the plan drawing? Yes. Doors are intended between pool and south patio, and between garage and interior hall.
- Garage with patio on top has been counted as FSR? Yes.
- Rear of house, grades: What is impact of proposed development on neighbor behind? At that property line there is an existing granite wall (neighbor is higher), with existing 20’ ht. fir hedge behind, between the neighbor and new house. Also, new house is to be set at lower grade than old house, so should be no problems with privacy/overlook
- Any relaxations requested? No.
- Impermeability calculations? Not yet.
- Patio geometry related to what? Home style.

Planning Comments and Questions to the Panel:

- The Panel reviewed this proposal on February 24, 2011. The Panel’s comment summary requested simplification in the design, a reduction of mass, especially at the front, a more neighbourly approach, and better

integration of soft and hard landscape. The Panel asked to see the proposal again before a DE application.

- Have comments been addressed? What is your response to how?
- Simulated slate product proposed meet guidelines?

Comments:

- Mixture of types of materials in landscape.
- Like overall.
- Accessible? Run code review for building
- No comments re slate
- Appropriate improvements made
- Slate: in principle okay. Have concerns about this product which is not, and is supported instead by ridged backing. Corners may curl over time. Find examples of product which have been in use for some time to determine if this is an issue.
- Landscape needs to have more discipline for it to coordinate with house.
- Like that will have glimpse of house from driveway
- Agree landscape & house are disjointed. Flow not as strong as in house.
- House very strong massing with stretched out footprint, so landscape needs to be stronger.
- To strengthen where plinth does push out to street - it pushes out patios of basement - so reduce these patios and bring garden to house.
- There is a lot of patio space, which reduces the available garden to become a series of linear spaces. Need to strengthen overall garden design to balance weight of house
- Agree basement patio in front are not necessary, garden would improve/strengthen setting of house if space not given over to these small patios.
- Consider other ways to strengthen garden further: informal lawn shapes are possibly resulting in disconnect.
- Driveway changes city requested are an improvement
- Concerned about quality and endurance of proposed faux slate material.
- Agree with earlier comments about landscape and roof materials.
- This is a massive house - maximum allowable size – shadowing a concern?
- Prefer real slate rather than faux
- Colour similar to adjacent house. Select colour which will have more differentiation from neighbor.
- Design improved significantly
- Landscape awkward and inconvenient to get to front door. Not practical.
- Materials. Keep looking to find superior roofing product.
- Massing. Extra garage adds a lot to the massing. Can owner live with a 3-car garage?

Comments Summary:

- Review comments from members
- Massing is still large
- Landscape needs to have stronger tie to home, fewer patios.
- Roof materials need to be reconsidered

MOTION: All support the Applicant proceed to DE Application with comments addressed, as moved by John Keen and seconded by Lisa MacIntosh.

## 2. **3940 Cypress Street**

Robert Johnson architect:

- Restorations to principle house & garage ongoing.
- Issue for Panel consideration: Pool and cabana siting
- Pool and cabana are meant to be finishing touch to grounds, with pool located to minimize impact on existing planting and allow for a lawn area immediately beside the house
- Want lawn for social functions.
- Existing hedges & planting screen preferred cabana location from street. No neighboring houses overlook this location.
- Site is irregular, with Cypress Street and Cedar Crescent on either side of lots, thus creating a strange situation of two front yards, and a very small backyard already taken up by the garage. Applicant suggests by existing appearance of existing hedging that Cypress Street is the ‘front’ of the property (neat and tidy, and location of front door), and Cedar Crescent is the ‘rear’ (untidy privet? hedging and fence needing replacement).
- City requires 9m setback from front property lines, which would mean a loss of existing laurel cluster (screening pool from Cypress street), and loss of beauty in garden.
- Arborist report says 9m setback will force pool & cabana to within minimum protection zones for trees. Report supports applicant’s preferred location
- 9m setback typically applies to principal house and not to an accessory building.
- Applicant considers the 9m setback a hardship and requests the panel consider the yard as a Sideyard with 3m setback instead.
- Distance from Cedar proposed at 4.8m. This would save the planting which provides an immediate screen.
- Pool and cabana materials: flagstone paving to tie into existing paving; cabana to tie visually with existing rear of house façade in materials and details.

Questions:

- Cabana size: ridge height? Nowhere near maximum allowable; footprint? 12’ x 12’
- Impermeable surface calculations?
- Fence design? Hedging? Will be cedar hedge with fence behind.

Planning Comments and Questions to the Panel:

- This is an irregular site containing a pre-1940s house. The Director of Planning has reviewed the site and deemed both Cedar Crescent and Cypress Street to be “front yards”. Front yard setbacks measure 9m in FSD. The owner is proposing a pool cabana. Accessory buildings are required to be in the rear yard, however the Director of Planning has the ability to relax this, considering among other things “the impact of alternate locations on the site”. As this site has very little rear yard, a pool cabana would have to be located in an alternate location. Staff are willing to consider an alternate location as long as it does not have undue impact on neighbours.
- What are panel comments regarding proposed siting and its effect on existing landscape and on streetscapes?

Comments:

- Sited in best spot to save existing trees, tucked into corner of yard
- Could have more drama if was a little taller, ie.9 ft height ceiling.
- Would be nice to do a nice fence
- Like plan and siting of cabana
- Agree with earlier comments (not sure it needs to be taller)
- No problem with siting- no houses adjacent
- Move cabana to other end of pool to serve lawn area more & for parties
- Relax perhaps with very substantial fence for a front yard
- Support siting
- Location in corner may be too exposed, that is too hidden for supervising pool play from the house.

Summary of Comments:

- Support siting
- Fence – ensure it is Shaughnessy type/quality to enhance streetscapes
- Perhaps make cabana a little more substantial to complement house

MOTION: All support the Applicant proceed to DE Application with comments addressed, as moved by John Keen and seconded by Paul Sangha.

**3. 3660 East Boulevard**

Andrew Cheung, architect:

- Lot slopes significantly, rising 18’ from front to rear of property.
- Stately home in garden setting
- Classical symmetry. Started off with Italian villa with low pitch roof. Staff recommended a stronger roof, so design style modified to a French villa.
- Roof height to max allowable 207’ ht.
- Massing located at higher end of site, like neighbors, with landscape terracing to street.
- Sideyards wider than required minimum.

- Materials: limestone base, stucco, slate roof, zinc flashings, wrought ironwork
- Parking: no underground parking due to slope, so 2 car garage at lane.

Ron Rule, landscape architect:

- Existing hedge along street to be removed. No significant trees. No plants worth keeping. Neighbor's tree to south hazardous.
- Front garden: Stairway from street to front door requires significant number of steps. Make stairway an interesting/enticing feature..
- Grades kept to existing on either side of stairway, with terraced planting to south and lower flattened garden to north.
- A lot of layering
- Rear garden: garage, sports court, and production garden – grape arbor, herb garden

Questions:

- Space labeled as mechanical room? At this point this is just left over space which will be refined as design progresses
- At max FSR? 6400 sq ft including garage. Covered porches not included (as per regulations)
- Size of property? 95' x 150' (14,254 sq ft)
- Sport court material? Not asphalt. Likely a sport court material

Planning Comments and Questions to the Panel:

- Existing post 1940's house
- The Director Planning would like your comments on the proposal with regard to the FSODP and Guidelines, and in particular on the proposed siting with regard to the streetscape, the tripartite composition, and the landscape approach, particularly the effect of enclosure and "entry vestibule".

Comments:

- Like newest scheme (French)
- Not overwhelming
- Streetscape & entry needs layering as much as possible. Axial approach foreshortens property. Off axis instead?
- Living in rear garden: covered patio is by garage and on north side (sun?), perhaps located patio and bbq to feed into green space towards south instead
- Schematic. Looks interesting. Overlooks train tracks perhaps not desirable. Wonder about rear - elevation and landscape facing east
- Want technical details (uncounted space etc) to understand massing.
- Mechanical room far too big. Why essential?
- Like grand stair, French style.
- Like formality in front.

- Rear not developed enough. A lot of structure in rear. How would this feel from the house?
- Dining terrace – living space may be dark
- Massing - unclear
- Not sure of massing when existing hedge removed. Big.
- Games lawn – like, but how will it do on north side of house?
- Like French chateau
- Siting – would push forward but may not be able to because of slope
- This area is the introduction to Shaughnessy. Although French option is best, it is not typical of Shaughnessy because it is symmetrical.
- Games lawn should go where there is sun.

Summary of Comments:

- Responding to sketches stage. Will be able to give better comments when less sketchy.
- Rear needs work

MOTION: All supported motion made by John Keen, seconded by Lisa MacIntosh, to see the proposal again as an enquiry, with comments addressed.

**4. 1518 Laurier Avenue**

Dwayne Chahill owner and developer:

- Existing home was pre-1940's which has been burned in fire 2 years ago. More than 60% fire damage.
- New owner purchased, and wishes to build a new home in accordance with FSD and ODP guidelines, reusing existing materials, masonry, brackets and etc (as possible).
- Decision to build new came after review by engineers & general contractors determined only 5 – 10% of existing home could be restored, due to structural damage and damage from standing open to weather for 2 years
- Also, the house had many additions over time: porte cochere, dormers

Raffaele Funaro, architectural designer:

- Architectural approach
  - use contextual design to work with neighbor buildings,
  - use existing materials where possible, i.e. granite stone of base
  - build to maximum square footage,
  - 2 car garage
- good materials: stucco, shake shingle roof, wood windows, cedar colour windows, lighter beige stucco/paint
- good landscape quality

Planning Comments and Questions to the Panel:

- Existing pre-1940's house of merit damaged by fire



- Earlier comment on house suggested it was a Samuel MacClure house, which has been determined not to be the case
- Property is too small for infill and house too small for MCD
- Fire damage: so much would have to be replaced that it couldn't be considered for heritage incentives through an HRA process
- Conditions for new building: keep form & character of old, incorporate viable architectural elements from the existing building are, and obtain a level of support from the FSAD Panel and neighbours.

#### Questions:

- No basement plan? not yet
- City has an opinion on re-buildability? No. The city assesses fire damage for safety. It won't fall down.
- How different from house with total re-do on inside? Loadbearing & walls badly burnt, not recommended.
- Panel here to protect heritage
- House proposed larger than existing? Yes. Existing 3500-3900 sq ft; proposed 4900 sq ft including garage (4600 sq ft above grade)
- How strong is burnt smell? Can smell it from street and beyond

#### Comments:

- Wouldn't try to keep it; support new house with planning conditions given.
- Smell would permeate restored building
- Original house robust. Use some of details of old, but make new more robust than drawings now propose
- New house looks like side elevation is on Laurier and front elevation is on Granville, but front door is on Laurier.
- Stone work on new design looks more ordinary. Like existing columns which have taller stone than base, and like little arch window at grade.
- Take down existing house. No heritage value if renovated.
- Needs more development & details to be robust.
- Agree due to lack of heritage value house should be replaced rather than restored.
- Like city requirement to keep with existing house details/elements
- Interesting and robust Tudor details on existing house.
- Landscape to FSD guidelines.
- Support removal, retaining language and flavor of existing house. Real Shaughnessy weight and texture to existing which should be picked up.
- How and what materials to be reused?
- Double doors not typically used.
- Granville street façade looks like main house façade. Very square lot; wider presence on Laurier needed.
- Agree with earlier comments.
- What are calculations?

- Eyebrow roof not in keeping.
- Doesn't make sense to retain, although it pains to say. New house needs to have more than a nod to existing house.
- Can't retain.
- Massing very different from existing. Perhaps reduce size to achieve planning goal of keeping form and character of old building

Summary of Comments:

- Not feasible to keep existing building due to extent of damage.
- New building to be in spirit of existing home, and use existing materials and elements without necessarily replicating them

MOTION: All supported motion made by Paul Sangha, seconded by Lisa MacIntosh, to see the new building proposal again as an enquiry, with comments addressed.

Meeting adjourned 7:00