

**First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel**  
**MINUTES of Meeting**  
**October 13<sup>th</sup>, 2011 - 4:00 pm - 6:00 pm**

---

<b>Present:</b>	Lori Kozub	Chair, SHPOA
	David Cuan	Vice Chair, Resident, SHPOA
	Erika Gardener	Resident, SHPOA
	Judith Hansen	Heritage Commission - left at 5pm
	Kathy Reichert	Resident, SHPOA
	John Keen	AIBC
	Jim Bussey	AIBC
	Paul Sangha	BCSLA
	Linda Collins	Resident Member at Large
	Jennifer Stamp	BCSLA
	Lisa MacIntosh	Real Estate Board
	Mamie Angus	Resident Member at Large
	Phil Yacht	Resident Member at Large
<b>Regrets:</b>	Paul Wu	Resident, SHPOA
<b>City Staff :</b>	Ann McLean	Development Planner, UDDPC
<b>Recording Secretary:</b>	Pri Toor	ARKS

---

**AGENDA**

**Business:**

Site visit: 3738 Hudson Street

1. Review of Minutes of September 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2011
2. Project Updates
3. Other Business - Welcome to Kathy Reichert

**New Business:**

1. Address: 3738 Hudson Street  
Inquirer: Loy Leyland Architect Inc.  
Status: DE 414988  
Review: First as Application  
Previous: July 24, 2008, March 25, 2010
2. Address: 1351 Laurier Avenue  
Inquirer: Loy Leyland Architect Inc.  
Status: DE 415042

Review: First as Application  
Previous: Oct 8, 09; Apr 15, 10; Jan 13, & May 19, 2011

3. Address: 3490 Pine Crescent  
Inquirer: Stefan Wiedemann  
Status: DE 414995  
Review: First as Application  
Previous: Feb 24, 2011, April 20, 2011

## **MEETING**

### **Site Visit, 3:30pm – 4:00pm**

Panel members visited the property at 3738 Hudson Street and looked at the exteriors of the existing house on the site prior to the start of this meeting.

### **Business, 4:15pm - 4:30pm:**

Chair Lori Kozub called the meeting to order at 4:15pm and a quorum is present.

1. Review of Minutes of September 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2011:  
Motion was made to pass the Minutes; Seconded; Passed.
2. Kathy Reichert was welcomed to the Panel as the new representative from SHPOA. Kathy has served the FSADP two terms previously. Currently, Kathy is a co-chair of the Housing Committee at the ARKS Vision Implementation group.
3. Projects Updates:  
No new applications but there were numerous enquiries.  
John Keene will abstain from the 1<sup>st</sup> Presentation, as per the AIBC guidelines.

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

1. **3738 Hudson Street, 4:20pm - 5:20pm:**  
Presentation: Loy Leyland Architect Inc, Donna Chomichuk, Landscape Architect  
Nur Jiwa Virani, Samir Virani, Piotr Djiewonski

Mr. Leyland presented the project:

The pre-1940 house has been studied for a number of years. This application includes a heritage study report that identified the house as lacking significant heritage value for retention and sketches of the various renovation options investigated that supports house demolition as the best option for the site. The new house is designed in the Arts and Crafts style to recall the look and feel of the original house and it is set back from the street. There is a porte cochere in the front with double columns, gables and retaining the character of the original roof line. The floor

plans are described as follows: Main Floor consists of a living room, formal stairs, library, ceremonial hallway, guest room, dining room, kitchen, family room and pantry. The basement consists of a recreation room, mechanical room, sauna spa, media room. There is a covered swimming pool, with its square footage is being proposed as part of the allowed FSR for the basement. A two-car garage is located within the house with another two-car garage in a separate accessory building. The second floor consists of two sets of stairs, with a ceremonial stairway that curves up and a gallery overlooking foyer, and 4 bedrooms with the Master bedroom that overlooks the yard. The detached garage is designed to look like a modest version of the house. The main house will have a traditional tri-partite expression with big gables to reduce the perceived building mass.

Ms. Chomichuk presented the landscaping design:

- Existing site is simple, keeping as much of the vegetation as possible.
- Front driveway has mature vegetation, low existing holly hedge low stone wall with metal fence with a yew hedge behind it. Lots of landscape layering proposed, having in the front large beech and maple trees the driveway comes along all the way to the back of the garage, there is a curve for small trees that will help screen the garage as much as possible.
- The other side of the property there is a pseudo Japanese garden, and we don't want to change the grading too much so propose to clean it up.
- In the back create an indoor outdoor flow from the patio to the lawn.
- The covered swimming pool level is lower than the main basement so that it is closer to the garden level; its south elevation is opened up to the garden and sunlight with access stairs and planters of vegetation.

Mr. Leyland and Ms. Chomichuk took questions from the Panel and provided the following further information:

- At a previous Enquiry, the Applicants had been asked to produce a Heritage Report on the property which was then prepared by Don Luxton.
- The entry foyer, adjacent hall, living rooms, library are double-height spaces.
- The pool house is 42x 23 with the pool being a bit smaller.
- Total 9300sqft - main floor is 5591sqft and 3709sqft below grade

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

The Panel reviewed the concept of retaining the existing house vs. constructing a new home at two previous enquiries. While the conclusion was not unanimous, the majority favoured exploring a retention scheme. Staff supports that approach.

The Proposal does not include retention. While the area policy does recommend retention of meritorious homes, as this is an application for a new home, it is useful if you offer commentary on the design, even if you do not support it in concept.

Staff do not support a new, second driveway crossing, and believe that the square footprint, and relatively flat roof forms could benefit from design development.

### Questions to the Panel:

The Director of Planning asks for your comments on the concept of building a new single family dwelling on this site, and your comments on the proposed design with regard to the FSODP and Guidelines.

### **Comments:**

- The existing structure on site is a wonderful charming house and it has more value because it is the only pre-1940 house left on this block. Although the Vancouver Heritage Register did not classify the structure as A, B or C, the house exemplifies the elegant craftsmanship and design of the early 1900s. First Shaughnessy should focus on retention, like historic areas of many cities in the world.
- Although many Panel members like the design of the proposed replacement home, most felt that the original house should be retained as the massing of the new house is not in keeping with the Shaughnessy design guidelines
- The structure over the proposed pool should not be considered as part of the FSR associated with “basement” as this impacts on the already significant building mass of the main house due to the liberal use of double-height spaces
- Some felt that the design of the new house is very similar to the n recently designed homes in the area and that this addition would make the area look like subdivision; the lovely charms of the existing home will be lost
- Most members felt that the existing house should be retained and updated with an addition. There have been too many pre-1940s homes have been taken down, diminishing the once charming and estate-like streetscapes of Shaughnessy
- The basement has a lot of unused area and the level could be redesigned to accommodate the pool to minimize the footprint of the built area on site
- The 2<sup>nd</sup> floor bedroom windows are all facing north and south and does not overlook the gardens located on the east and west side of the property

### **Comments Summary:**

Thank you for the presentation. In summary, 10 out of 13 Panel Members felt that the original home should be retained. On the question of the design of the new house many Panel Members liked the design of the new house as you have kept with the spirit of the old house. The massing is overwhelming and appears a significant intrusion for the neighbourhood. Consider the comments in particular about the massing, the pool and the double height spaces.

### **MOTION:**

Motion was made that the Panel does not support the demolition of the existing house and should the planning department approve demolition we should like to see new home proposed with significantly smaller massing. Seconded. 12 out of 13 support motion. John Keene abstained. Passed.

## **2. 1351 Laurier Avenue, 5:30pm – 5:55pm:**

Presentation: Loy Leyland Architect

Mr. Leyland made the presentation on the project. The design is to keep the memory of the existing house. The new design has added arches on the porch with smooth stucco finish being true to the memory of the existing house. Added brick on the stairs and at posts near the street, responding to previous Panel comments.

Pulled house back; had roof issue with east elevation now it is quite charming; the little balcony windows have been all cleaned up.

No questions from the Panel.

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

The Panel reviewed this proposal several times as an enquiry and ultimately supported the demolition of the existing pre-1940s home. At the last enquiry review the Panel supported the proposal but recommended further development to the east elevation and detailing including roof overhangs and base treatment.

### Questions to the Panel:

The Director of Planning asks for your comments on the proposed design with regard to the FSODP and Guidelines.

### **Comments:**

- Many Panel Members supported the design of the new house and general proposal of the project
- Some members felt the landscape to be very unclear: no clarity in broken curves and scalloped edges and question the value of sitting in eastern side yard. There were also comments that there is insufficient landscape layering on the front street. The hedge and single tree on either side of the front door does not address the guideline of the relationship of the main level to the garden. In the back the circulation of the pool needs hefty amount of design element
- Many Panel Members liked all the elevations and improvements although some felt that the problem with the front fenestration all windows seem to speak to each other, low cast eaves on the front changing the character to fit more with the rest of the house
- Applaud the house in its simplicity and some would like the railings on the front to be more transparent.

### **Comments Summary:**

The Panel approves the home design and keeping it in spirit of the original house. Follow up with the landscape architect for the front, east and back yard to see how these areas can better complement the aesthetics and the function of the house.

### **MOTION:**

Motion was made to support the proposal with comments addressed. Seconded. All in favour. Passed.

### 3. 3490 Pine Crescent, 6:00pm:

Presentation: Stefan Wiedemann

Mr. Wiedemann made the presentation on the Project. The changes that were addressed are: the access points coming into the property; shifted the gate to give more of a private feel; removal of garage; the front deck off the building went around the corner and pulled the garage doors more towards the street. There is more landscaping near the house; enable the building to step forward; added stairs running back into the rear yard. The hard landscape patios are softened with adjacent planting; created a bit more rigor on the patio. The current proposal also calmed down the roof major issue related to the streetscapes. Existing hedge will be retained with 6 foot high wall; added landscaping on site grade issue; patios in the back are stepped down into the landscape and step up into the natural grade. Middle portion of the building itself has remained largely the same in terms of its overall massing. Architecture has been simplified since original drawings

Questions:

The Presenter took questions and provided the following information:

- Roof material - symphony slate 50 year roof not of asphalt, Slate is made of pvc product, torch on material on the flat roof
- Roof overhangs are 21 inches
- Have an agreement with neighbour who is going to have his own driveway where they were shared: each property will have its own private driveway.
- There is going to be a wall of green buffer to add between the properties
- Wanted to create a vestibule for our entrance courtyard
- Pulled the plinth back towards the building and pulled off the corner; building drops down to grade on the west side; number of openings have been reduced only 2 openings one into the rec. room and 1 into the pool north facing window off pool area.
- The pedestrian's view from the street is mainly soft landscape but a bit of roofline, except at access points; the house will be less visible than the existing structure on the site.
- Materials of the house: limestone or "Fiber Crown" - window trims heavy profile; base – stucco; flat roof even with the mini porticoes - typical French feature; Will be at maximum height.
- Rationale behind making the back lawn into 3 lawns - one is little bit higher and comes up on to the two sides smaller more intimate green spaces in the back

Planning Comments and Questions to the Panel:

The Panel reviewed this proposal twice as an enquiry. The Panel's summary commented on the large massing of the house and the lack of integration of landscape with the architecture.

#### Questions to the Panel

The Director of Planning asks for your comments on the proposed design with regard to the FSODP and Guidelines.

Comments:

Panel Members like to commend the architect on the proposed grand house; the front and side elevations height is demonstrative of Shaughnessy – entry circuitous and resist the flat roof portions which are main entry feature piece to be cut off seems a little arbitrary - also the way the side sheds are flattened off. Designer to consider design modification of the entrance porch as it seems too small and low key for the proposed house.

Panel members felt there needed to be more landscaping more significant trees, the plant list is not sufficient given the amount of planting. Too varied in the amount of material and there seems to be a lot of different forms and materials where it is going in significant contrast with the rigor and scale of the house design. Might want to refine that rear of the house, engage the garden - no significant vegetation, any way of formalizing the edge with a more built interface

Panel Members felt that the improvements are significant and that there is an opportunity to be a great home.

Panel Members felt that what was missing is the validity and calmness of the landscape which comes across busy and cluttered

**Comments Summary:**

Panel appreciates all the efforts put into this proposal; it is a really pretty project, nice addition to the area. The roof lines need more work; a grander landscaping might better integrate it with the house. Would like to see a lot more big trees proposed for the property. Shaughnessy is about landscape layering and properly scaled trees that complement the built forms.

**MOTION:**

Motion was made to support this project with comments addressed in particular to the landscape and roof line. 2 opposed. Seconded. All in Favour. Passed.

Meeting adjourned at 6:25pm. Next meeting on November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2011.