

**First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel**  
**MINUTES of Meeting**  
**December 15<sup>th</sup>, 2011 - 4:00 pm - 6:00 pm**

---

<b>Present:</b>	Lori Kozub Hodgkinson Erika Gardener Mamie Angus Linda Collins Jim Bussey Jennifer Stamp Lisa MacIntosh	Chair, SHPOA Resident, SHPOA Resident Member at Large Resident Member at Large AIBC BCSLA Real Estate Board
<b>Regrets:</b>	David Cuan Phil Yacht Paul Woo Judith Hansen John Keen Paul Sangha	Vice Chair, Resident, SHPOA Resident Member at Large Resident Member at Large Heritage Commission AIBC BCSLA
<b>City Staff :</b>	Ann McLean Tim Potter	Development Planner, UDDPC Development Planner, UDDPC
<b>Recording Secretary:</b>	Jennifer Stamp	BCSLA

---

**AGENDA**

**Business:**

1. Review of Minutes of November 24, 2011
2. Project Updates
3. Other Business

**New Business:**

1. Address: 1664 Cedar Crescent  
Inquirer: Loy Leyland  
Status: Enquiry  
Review: First

## **MEETING**

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

Chair Lori Kozub Hodgkinson called the meeting at 4:00pm and noted a quorum.

1. Review of Minutes of November 24th, 2011: Minutes had not been completed
2. Project Updates: New Applications
  - 1696 Laurier – DE415331- Application- to install parking under existing stone deck
  - 3851 Marguerite Street - DE415217- Application- to relocate garage in rear yardDue to the small scope of these projects, they will not be presented to the FSADP.
2. No Other Business Matters

### **Inquiry, 4:15pm - 6:00pm:**

#### **1. 1664 Cedar Crescent**

Presentation: Loy Leyland, Donna Chomichuk, Property Owners

Mr. Leyland outlined three options for the proposed home. He noted this is not a typical Shaughnessy lot because there is no back lane and the property site sits between Cedar Crescent and Pine Crescent. He presented three options for the driveway and parking. The client would like a circular driveway which would add another street crossing on Cedar Crescent. Mr. Leyland noted that he recognizes the FSODP does not allow for garage doors facing the street, but he would like consideration. He noted an example of garage doors facing the street at 1636 Marpole Street.

Mr. Leyland presented three options. Option 1 is to use the existing driveway location from Cedar with the garage doors facing the street, using large trees and berms as barriers from the street view. Option 2 is to have a large circular driveway with garage doors facing the street, using large trees and berms as barriers from the street view. Option 3 is to have the garage doors on the side of the house. Mr. Leyland stated that the third option for the client provides a narrow long deep driveway mainly due to the significant change in grade. With all options the house will have the same square footage – 5900 sq. ft.

Ms. Chomichuk briefly discussed the landscape plan. Several trees would have to be removed as noted on the Arborist report. The trees were noted as “low value”. She also noted that designing the yard is more challenging if there is a large “tunnel like” drive way and high retaining walls.

#### **Questions:**

Mr. Leyland and Ms. Comminchuk took questions from the Panel.

Applicants responded with further information:

- The lot is 13500 sq. ft
- Grade change is 199' – 218'
- The owners have not talked to neighbors about their preference
- Interlocking pavers for the driveway
- Mr. Leyland and the client prefers option 2
- Ms. Chomichuk could not comment when asked if the garden would be minimal if option 2 was chosen.
- Mr. Leyland felt 2<sup>nd</sup> driveway entrance was “estate like”
- Mr. Leyland did not know what the size of the original house is
- Applicant believes option 3 would be difficult to employ because of their elderly family and “tunnel like” driveway

During questions Ann McLean advised that City Planning does not support adding a second entrance to support a circular driveway because it changes the street scape. She further clarified that ODP Guidelines state that front facing garage doors are not supported and do not encourage “masking” the doors facing the front as an option.

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

This site contains a pre-date house that was reviewed by Planning last year. The Director of Planning agreed that the existing house was not of architectural merit, and its small size and location on the site made it extremely difficult to add to.

This proposal is a preliminary proposal for a new single family dwelling. The Director of Planning has supported using Cedar Crescent as the front of the property (it is double fronting).

Several options for vehicle access are proposed. Planning supports an option similar to Option 3, with a side access driveway. This is most compliant with the ODP and Guidelines. The other options result in additional hard surfacing, and a large and visible garage door. We have asked for maximum retention of mature and healthy landscaping.

The enquiry team has noted that 1636 Marpole Avenue has a visible garage door. I cannot comment on the specifics of this application, completed in 1996. However, I can note that while the appearance of the home is compliant with the area policy, the large amount of paving in the front yard, and visible garage door, is not a condition we would like to see replicated.

**Questions to the Panel:**

The Director of Planning asks if the Panel for their comments on the proposed vehicle access, and for other comments on the proposal with regard to the FSODP and Guidelines.

**Comments:**

- The majority of the Panel members support option 3 because the house will fit

better within the neighborhood and is within the ODP guidelines.

- Two Panel members supported the circular driveway concept if landscaped well because option 3 has high walls and a deep “tunnel like” driveway.

**Comments Summary:**

The majority of the Panel (4/6) believes the Applicant should stay within ODP guidelines which would be Option 3. The Panel does not want to have precedent -setting circumstances with approving a second driveway entrance and having garage doors facing the street.

**MOTION:**

Motion was made that the applicant returns to the Panel with a singular proposal of the applicants’ choice considering the Panel’s comments. Seconded. 7 in favor, 1 not in favor. Passed.