

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel
MINUTES of Meeting
August 23, 2012 - 4:15 pm – 5:17 pm

Present:	Robert Miranda	Chair, Resident Member at Large
	Erika Gardner	Resident-SHPOA
	Alastair Munro	Resident-SHPOA
	John Chan	SHPOA - Resident
	Kerri-Lee Watson	Resident Member-at-Large
	Linda Collins	Resident Member-at-Large
	Jim Bussey	AIBC
	Clinton Cuddington	AIBC
	Paul Sangha	BCSLA
	Jennifer Stamp	BCSLA
	David Cuan	Heritage Commission
Regrets:	George Affleck	Councillor, City of Vancouver
	Katherine Reichert	Vice- Chair, Resident- SHPOA
	Sabine Wood	Resident Member-at-Large
	Lisa McIntosh	Real Estate Board
City Staff:	Tim Potter	Development Planner, UDDPC
Recording Secretary:	David Cuan	

AGENDA

1. Review of Meeting Minutes August 2, 2012
2. Recent Project Updates
3. Project Review:
 - .1 Address: 3660 East Boulevard
Inquirer: Andrew Cheung Architects Inc.
Status: DP Application
Review: Sixth (First as Application, quorum not present in an earlier presentation)

MEETING

Chair Robert Miranda called the meeting at 4:15pm and noted that there was a quorum. David volunteered to take the minutes of this meeting as Samantha, our usual recording secretary is not present.

Business:

4:15pm – 4:30pm

1. Review of Meeting Minutes dated August 2, 1012: Review postponed to next meeting.
2. Project Updates
 - 4049 Cartier St: The project is likely to come back to the panel for review; the proponent is still pushing for a new street crossing on Cartier.
 - 1050 Laurier: A new enquiry on the address coming to panel at the next meeting.
 - 3990 Marguerite: Project will come back to the panel with retention studies.

There was a brief discussion on the FSODP's goal of preserving meritorious pre-1940 homes. The panel members reconfirmed that the evaluation criteria for heritage retention should include contextual considerations and not rely solely on the architectural/historical/social merits of the individual structure under consideration.

4:30pm – 5:17pm

3. 3660 East Boulevard – First as DP Application

The architect presented the project with the following revisions:

- Overall building height lowered
- Building facades with better-proportioned architectural elements
- Building mass simplified

The landscape architect pointed out that the following revisions to the proposed landscape design:

- Landscape parterres replaced with lawns
- A retaining wall and stairs in the front yard removed to simplify the grade changes
- Entrance terrace simplified
- Shorter tree specimens specified for the front yard

Questions from the Panel:

The proponents took questions from the panel members and responded as follows:

- Roof finish specified is asphalt shingles but may consider slate if the owner agrees to this change.
- The reduced building height is achieved by decreasing the main floor elevation, ceiling height of the main floor and lowered roof eaves.
- The axial landscape approach to the centrally located house entry is similar to that

of the adjacent neighbour and others in 1st Shaughnessy such as Hycroft.

- The “sport court” at the rear of the site will be asphalt paved for an even play area. This area will be gated/fenced. No details on these structures available.
- The attic will not be habited
- No material boards, rendered drawings available for presentation

Planning Comments to the Panel:

The Panel reviewed this proposal on June 21st. There was no quorum at this meeting but the members present offered the following comments:

- a) The undated design seemed more cohesive than previous versions
- b) Concerns from the neighbour located uphill to the site regarding the proposed building mass, location and height should be adequately addressed
- c) Concern about the use of asphalt shingles as roofing material
- d) Concerns about the overly formal landscape design and the proposed large tree specimens’ effect on the neighbours and streetscape

Planning Questions to the Panel:

Have the revisions adequately addressed the panel’s previous comment?

Have concerns for the neighbouring sites been adequately addressed?

General comments on the composition and treatment of the soft/hard landscape and the parking areas as shown in the Landscape site plan.

Panel’s Comments:

- Concerns about the incremental nature of how the applicant addresses design issues that were brought up in previous reviews; a perception remains that the design revisions are made on the fly and not based on a coherent approach
- Concerns about the axial approach to the main entry from the street. The design guidelines for the area encourage picturesque approaches to main entries of the homes.
- Concerns about the uniform sizes of the proposed specimen trees and the lack of landscape layering effects much desired in 1st Shaughnessy
- Landscape design is not compatible to the proposed home; it seems to have a life of its own.
- The DP application is incomplete as it does not include rendered drawings, materials board, and clear choices of finish materials.
- Panel encourages the designers to engage their client in a dialogue on the aesthetics promoted by the FSODP to resolve the design development for the project

Summary of the Panel's Comments:

There were some improvements on the house design but there remain grave concerns about the approach to landscaping. There is not enough information presented for this stage of application.

Applicant's Comments:

The applicant maintains that revisions were made to address the panel's concerns voiced in the previous reviews. (Panel responded that this incremental approach to revisions underlines the lack of design coherence.)

Motion:

"To have the project come back to the panel for another review after the applicant meets with the planner and address the issues brought up at this meeting."

Motion made by Jennifer and seconded by John. Carried unanimously.

Meeting Adjournment: 5:17pm.