

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel
MINUTES of Meeting
December 6th, 2012 - 4:00 pm – 5:36 pm

| | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Present: | Robert Miranda | Chair, Resident Member-at-Large |
| | Katherine Reichert | Vice- Chair, Resident- SHPOA |
| | John Chan | Resident - SHPOA |
| | Erika Gardner | Resident - SHPOA |
| | Alastair Munro | Resident - SHPOA |
| | Linda Collins | Resident Member-at-Large |
| | Kerri-Lee Watson | Resident Member-at-Large |
| | Sabine Wood | Resident Member-at-Large |
| | Jim Bussey | AIBC |
| | Clinton Cuddington | AIBC |
| | Jennifer Stamp | BCSLA |
| | David Cuan | Heritage Commission |

| | | |
|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Regrets: | Paul Sangha | BCSLA |
| | Lisa McIntosh | Real Estate Board |

| | | |
|---------------------|------------|----------------------------|
| City Staff : | Colin King | Development Planner, UDDPC |
| | Tim Potter | Development Planner |

Recording Secretary: Samantha Luk

AGENDA

Business:

1. Review Minutes of October 25, 2012
2. Project Updates

New Business:

Address: 1656 Angus Drive
Inquirer: Studio V Design
Status: Enquiry
Review: First

MEETING

Business,

Chair, Robert Miranda called the meeting at 4:05pm and noted that there was a quorum.

1. Review of Minutes dated: October 25, 2012.

Motion was made to approve the Minutes; Seconded; Motion passed.

2. Project Updates

- 1389 Matthews has come in as an application.
- 1433 Angus Drive – Application will not come before the panel because alterations to the exterior are minor and the City is satisfied that the project is within guidelines.
- 3660 East Boulevard – The project will be moving to a decision soon and will not come before the Panel again.

The Panel expressed some concerns with how the Planning department decides which projects are chosen to come back before the Panel. The Panel would like to be informed of all projects in the area especially those which involve alterations to the exterior.

The Panel requests from Staff an explanation as to why 3660 East Boulevard is not coming back to the Panel since at Panel's meeting on 23rd August a motion was passed stating that the project should "come back to the panel for another review after the applicant meets with the planner and address(es) the issues brought up at this meeting".

1. 1656 Angus Drive – Enquiry

Mr. Van Dyke stated that arson occurred on this site and damaged one half of the upper floor. The project being proposed is for a new house that will sit almost exactly where the existing house currently sits. The building will be partly faced in Hardy stone. Real timbers will be used on the outside of the house and detailed fascia boards, zinc gutters, collector boxes, and Corbel brackets will be added to enhance the Tudor style of the house. Old-fashioned wood-floated stucco, wood windows with 5/8 lead divisions, and Tudor chimneys will also be used in an attempt to follow the Tudor detailing. The brick used in this project has flecks of brown and will not be a red brick. It will be used for the chimney, front steps, and some for the hard landscaping. A cedar shingle roof will be installed. The existing garage structure will be taken down and an underground garage will be built with a garden above it. All the existing trees on the property will be kept. The underground parking garage will replace the existing tennis courts and will be smaller in square footage. The impermeability of the site is well under what is allowed.

The landscape of the street front will not change much. A granite wall will replace an

existing low hidden brick wall and a 6 feet yew English hedge will be planted behind the wall. The existing driveway gate will be retained and brick pillars will be added. The pathway into the property will be comprised of grey limestone and there will be pathways running along the house in either direction. The east side driveway will be 12 feet wide, made of grey concrete permeable pavers, and will slope down to the underground garage. The west side of the property will have stone slab pavers around the side of the house and boxwood hedge. A driveway entrance on the west side will be removed and replaced by a stone wall and a hedge. The terrace in the rear yard will have approximately the same footprint as the existing tennis court. The walkout is at basement level, which is higher than the existing tennis court level by approximately 3 feet. The existing chestnut, English beech and ginkgo tree will all have their root zones left intact and will not be disturbed during construction. The bottom of the pool will act as a skylight to allow light into the underground parking garage.

Questions from the Panel:

Mr. Van Dyke and Mr. Craigs took questions from the Panel.

Applicants responded with further information:

- The landscape is a reflection of the Tudor style, with a structured layout and the use of boxwood.
- The total FSR is below the maximum permitted, and the parking garage is included in the FSR.
- The square footage of the house is 10,432.
- The square footage of the underground parking garage is 3628, within the 0.45 FSR.
- Above the parking garage, the planting depth will be 18 inches.
- The lawn will not be directly over the parking garage. The pool will act as a skylight for the garage.
- There is no arborist report.
- One cherry tree will be taken down near the house.
- The terrace walls will be granite. The paving in the back will be brick with grey limestone hedging, and carved granite will be used for the pool.
- The proposed new FSR is approximately 1000 square feet more than the existing.
- The environmental initiatives have not been addressed yet.
- There is no access from the basement directly into the parking garage. The owners will have to walk outside to get to the garage.
- The pool will be ornamental.
- The original house was 3 feet lower in height.
- There is only one exit for the garage.
- The existing vs. original impermeability is approximately the same.
- Above the garage will be considered impermeable.
- The storm water retention tank location has not yet been determined.

Planning Comments to the Panel:

None

Planning Questions to the Panel:

None

Panel's Comments:

- A few panel members support the idea of requesting a height limit relaxation, as they would like to see the house better reflect the Tudor style with a steeper and higher pitched roof.
- The panel commends the designers for their use of high quality materials, attention to detail and preservation of existing trees.
- There is some concern about the underground parking garage but most of the panel have no objections.
- There is some concern over the proximity of the car coming to the property line and how it encroaches the set back line.
- There is some concern regarding the accessibility from the house to the garage. Some panel members feel that the owners may want to connect the garage to the house especially during the winter.
- There is some concern that the amount of soil depth over the parking garage is not enough for the viability of plants.
- One member feels that the front yard could use more asymmetry and layering.
- Some panel members would like to see an arborist report and for the arborist to take a look at the ginkgo tree.
- One panel member would like to see some environmental initiatives used in the heating and cooling of the home.
- The Chair expressed the opinion that whilst this design for a Tudor style house as presented was well detailed, he had grave misgivings about the fundamental notion of building a Tudor style house at all. The Design Guidelines do not state that a new house should be built in a past period style. And he felt that these pastiche-like designs for new houses contributed nothing to a progressive architecture. Just because the neighbourhood has been labeled "heritage" does not mean that new houses have to be built in some traditional style; the neighbourhood should not be a museum of old architectural styles.

Motion:

None as this is an enquiry.

Meeting adjourned at 5:36.