

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel
MINUTES of Meeting
February 16th, 2012 - 4:00 pm – 7:00 pm

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

Recording Secretary: Samantha Luk

AGENDA

Business:

1. Review of Minutes of December 15, 2011
2. Project Updates

New Business:

1. Address: 1937 Hosmer Avenue
Inquirer: Clinton Cuddington, Measured Architecture Inc.
Status: Enquiry
Review: First
2. Address: 1939 Matthews Ave
Inquirer: Benjamin Ling, B. Ling Architect Inc.

Status: Enquiry
Review: First

3. Address: 1451 Angus Drive
Inquirer: Jim Bussey, Formwerks Architectural Inc.
Status: Enquiry
Review: First

MEETING

Business, 4:11pm – 5:33pm:

Vice Chair, David Cuan called the meeting at 4:11pm and noted that there was no quorum.

1. Review of Minutes of December 15th, 2011:
Amend minutes to show that Kathy Reichert was present at the December 15th, 2011 meeting. Linda Collins wanted it noted that following this meeting, she reconsidered her position on the 1664 Cedar Crescent project and now prefers a driveway alongside the house rather than the proposed circular driveway. Motion was made to pass the Minutes; Seconded; Passed.
2. Project Updates
No new significant enquiries fielded by Planning.
There has been no formal decision made on 3738 Hudson St.
An inquiry was made about 3538 Cypress St and it was stated that there has been no formal decision on the approval of this project.

4:15pm – 5:33pm:

1. 1937 Hosmer Avenue - Inquiry

Presentation: Clinton Cuddington and Piers Cuddington (Measured Architecture), Megan Faulkner (Donald Luxton) and Paul Sangha (Paul Sangha Landscape Architect)

Architectural

Mr. Cuddington noted that the owner wants to maintain the existing structure but wants to see it modernized and restored back to its former glory. He proposed a lantern-like element to the existing heritage house with a small component of it nestled in the front dormer and flanking the side dormer, which will not take a dominant place in the front façade. This lantern will create a modern interpretation of a traditional widow's watch. He stated that there was a 1990 renovation, which created a "skirt" at the base of the property that negated the tri-partite design element typical of First Shaughnessy homes. The proposal seeks to remove the stone cladding under the porch that was not original to the house, and add a stone base on the rear and two sides to unify with the existing front stone base. New windows in the kitchen will complement the existing ones elsewhere in

the house. The existing garage will be repositioned to conform to setback requirements and lift it 3' higher than its current elevation to flatten the slope of the driveway and allow for a pool house below the garage. The base of the garage would be designed in a manner to match the proposal for the base of the main house.

Heritage

Ms. Faulkner stated that the house was built in 1910 and the design was inspired by an American four-square house with an open plan layout and a high level of craftsmanship. She commented that most of the contemporary interventions would be made on the back of the house.

Landscaping

Mr. Sangha commented that the landscape design is based on a layered approach with a play on the four-square architectural design such as the location of 4 trees at the main entry of the house. He stated that the existing front driveway access to the property would be maintained but some of the lawn will be removed to suit the new circular driveway and internal road access to the back of the house. The garage will be relocated and elevated 3 feet to be on par with the neighbour's property. A set of stairs will be built off the veranda leading into the backyard and the entertainment area will be built on a decking system so no excavation will be required. One tree has already been removed and a number of trees will have to be removed, specifically a Douglas Fir and a Hawthorne. Lastly, two trees near the property line are dead and the neighbour's have been notified.

Questions from the Panel:

Mr. Cuddington took questions from the Panel.

Applicants responded with further information:

- There will be an area increase of 700 square feet for impermeable surfaces.
- The lantern will provide some extra lighting but the goal is to create an illumination effect that should not negatively impact on the neighbours.
- The lantern would provide daylight lighting for the reading room, master bedroom and bathrooms.
- Changes in the front façade will include the small lantern element, glazing, painting, and new windows. The existing stone base to remain.
- The garage would be raised 3 feet and its ridgeline will be 1 foot over the bylaw's 20 feet maximum.
- Exterior alterations focus on the back of the house and the 1990's renovation zone.

Planning Comments to the Panel:

The Planning Department supports the retention of this pre-1940 home and the location of the addition at the rear.

Planning Questions to the Panel:

The Director of Planning (DOP) seeks Panel comments and feedback on the proposal with regards to FS ODP and Guidelines and specific comments on the proposed widow's watch and its effect on the streetscape. Additionally, the DOP asks for comments on whether there is any specific heritage value to the garage.

Panel's Comments:

Paul Sangha abstained from this portion of the meeting.

- Most panel members do not have an issue with tearing down and rebuilding the garage as it is not really considered heritage.
- Most members support the addition of the lantern, however at least one member was uncomfortable with the lantern proposal and its expression at the front of the house. There is concern that this proposal may not be supportable under the existing ODP design guidelines.
- One member suggested that the stairs down to the garden should be moved to the other side to allow for easier access from the kitchen/family room.
- Some members were concerned with the proposed base apron plinth and pocket "pullbacks" at the South/West elevations of the house.
- Concerns about the target of 60% of site area for the proposed impermeable surfaces.

Summary of the Panel's Comments:

The panel is excited about this project and is gratified that there is an exciting proposal for an existing heritage home, that respects its heritage but is adventurous to play with its vernacular. There is some concern over the lantern, its expression at the front elevation of the house and how it will affect the neighbours. There is also concern about the base of the house, how it is treated, and its functionality. There is a difference of opinion on whether to retain the existing garage but its replacement should not a major issue. The architect should also minimize the proposed impermeable landscaping.

Motion:

None as there was no quorum at the meeting

5:33pm – 6:20pm:

2. 1389 Matthews Ave - Inquiry

Presentation: Benjamin Ling (B. Ling Architect Inc.) and Julie Hicks (Viewpoint Landscape Architect)

Architectural

Mr. Ling outlined the proposal to construct a new single family dwelling with a total square footage of 9800 square feet (a main floor of 4000 square feet and an upper floor

of 2500 square feet). The deep and narrow property is surrounded by trees on 3 sides and the proposed house will be about 50 feet in width. To preserve the backyard, the proposed development would include a 4 car garage located 3 feet below grade at the basement level and accessible from the front driveway. The main floor would be 4 feet above grade with the portion over the garage at 6 feet above grade. Mr. Ling noted that the design and materials of this project is still a work in progress but includes heavy timber brackets, typical grade granite posts, and red brick on the bottom of the house which goes around to form part of the open terrace in the back.

Landscaping

Ms. Hicks briefly discussed the landscape plans. The house will be set back on the property to provide for a larger front yard, and existing pathway would be maintained by slightly curved to use as a pedestrian access. Along the front property line a stone and brick combination wall will be erected. The current backyard garden is run down with severe drainage problems with ivy growing on the fence and trees. An Arborist report has not been obtained yet, however a preliminary drawing was presented and Ms. Hicks noted that there were a couple of trees along the fence line that were a concern. There will be plants introduced into the new garden and some transplanting will occur. The client would like to see the existing rural character of the back yard retained.

Questions from the Panel:

Mr. Ling and Ms. Hicks took questions from the Panel.

Applicants responded with further information.

- The reason for a separate driveway and pedestrian entrance was to allow pedestrians to enter the house via a garden versus a paved area.
- Red colour regular sized bricks will be used
- The roofing material will consist of cedar shingles

Planning Comments to the Panel:

Planning has reviewed the proposal to demolish a post-date house (1987) and to construct a new single family dwelling with general support for the design concept as presented. The design approach appears to be in general conformance to the FSODP and Guidelines.

Questions to the Panel:

The Director of Planning seeks Panel comments relevant to the FS ODP and Guidelines.

Panel's Comments:

- The Panel generally likes the overall design of the home and its robust vernacular.
- Some panel members have reservations with the roofline at the front entry as it is not typical of First Shaughnessy and more representative of the 1.5 storey homes in Kitsilano.

- Some members felt that the stairs from the house to the garden should be more open and grand to provide a more gracious entrance to the garden.
- A majority of the panel expressed concern about the combination of red brick and granite at the front of the house.
- One member questioned the pedestrian entrance and whether there would be privacy issues.
- Another member questions the flat roof tower-like structure located near the front of the house.

Summary of the Panel’s Comments:

There was great appreciation for the retention of the greenery on site. However, there was some concern over linking the house to the garden for better use and aesthetics. There was also concern over the front of the house and whether it is grand enough for First Shaughnessy. Lastly, there was apprehension on whether using red brick in tandem with granite is the correct choice.

Motion:

None as there was no quorum at the meeting.

6:20pm – 7:00pm:

3. 1451 Angus Drive - Inquiry

Presentation: Jim Bussey (Formwerks Architectural Inc.)

Mr. Bussey outlined that the original Heritage B House will be retained in place. With the extensions proposed, the site will be filled out with additional volume and grandeur: a circular driveway, second vehicular street access and porte-cochere are proposed. The heritage expression is found in the front portion of the house. The existing woodwork and framing window treatments are representatives of these heritage elements. The proposed additions enhance the existing heritage home by making it grander in proportion to its large site. Most of the existing trees will be retained except for the removal of deciduous trees, which will be replaced with a hedge and one tree will be removed to accommodate a porch and an additional family room. A new 5 car garage will conform in building area to the guidelines for accessory buildings located at rear yards. There is a request for additional living space located over this garage. Preservation of trees is a major concern of this redevelopment project.

Questions from the Panel:

Mr. Bussey took questions from the Panel.

Applicants responded with further information.

- There will be living space above the garage and the total height of the garage inclusive of this will be 20 feet. This roof will follow the same pitch as the main house.

- The windows of the proposed addition will be different from the existing to remain in the retained portion of the house: wood divided light casement windows vs. traditional double-hung units.
- The skylight at the back of the house is to provide light to in to the interior of the house and may be visible.
- The basement floor will be lowered to accommodate taller headroom.
- There is no existing gate to the property.
- The driveway width is 10 feet and expands to 16 feet at the back of the porte-cochere.
- Pedestrian access to the property is located between the two vehicular crossings.

Planning Comments to the Panel:

Planning supports the retention of this pre-date Heritage B house, noting that the general approach to the architectural expressions of the addition areas seem to fit well with the existing house. The request for a second crossing and through drive is not consistent with FSD guidelines and is not supported by Planning. Planning notes the accessory buildings sitting needs adjusting and as proposed will require the removal of one or more mature trees.

Planning Questions to the Panel:

- The Director of Planning asks if the general architectural character of the proposed additions suited to the house and responsive to the FS ODP guidelines.
- The Director of Planning seeks specific comments on the placement of the parking structure at the rear with regard to tree retention and neighbourly development.
- The Director of Planning seeks the Panel’s comments and feedback on the porte-cochere, driveway extension, and the proposed new crossing.

Panel’s Comments:

Jim Bussey abstained from this portion of the meeting.

- The panel did not have an issue with the second crossing and support a circular driveway, however there was a suggestion for a realignment/adjustment on the curvature of the driveway to provide more clearance for some of the existing trees on the site.
- The panel liked the front of the house but noted that the back elevations of the house (north) and the landscaping proposal require further design development.
- Some members commented that there may be too many access openings along the front property line and suggested to locate the pedestrian gate next to one of the vehicle entrances.
- There was a suggestion to move the parking garage under the house and to relocate the proposed pool in the accessory building at the rear of the property.
- There was no consensus on the size of the garage, some thought it was too large while others did not have an issue with it.

- The mix of the new and the old was well liked, however one member commented that the skylight is not consistent with a heritage building.

Summary of the Panel's Comments:

There was a general consensus that the second crossway and circular driveway would enhance the features of the property and it nice to see the existing heritage home kept. There was some discussion whether the 5 car garage is too big and whether it should be underground and have the pool relocated in the proposed accessory building at the rear. There was a suggestion to locate the pedestrian access next to one of the vehicle crossings as there may be too many openings at the front of the property. The landscape comments suggested that there needed to be some design changes and that the proposed vehicular roadways within the site will limit soft landscape opportunities, particularly in the back yard where the garage is located.

Motion:

None as there was no quorum at the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 7:00pm.