



CITY OF VANCOUVER

COMMUNITY SERVICES
Planning Department
Current Planning

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

Minutes of the Meeting of April 7, 2005

Present:	Robert Miranda (Chair)	Resident - Member at Large
	Beth Noble (Vice-Chair)	Resident - SHPOA Member
	Maureen Molaro	Resident - SHPOA member
	Michael Roburn	Resident - SHPOA Member
	Barbara Campney	Resident - Member at Large
	Michelle McMaster	BCSLA
	Steve Palmier	AIBC
	Richard Keate	Heritage Commission Representative

Vacant	Resident - Member at Large
	Resident - Member at Large

Regrets/Absences:	Carole Walker Angus	Resident -SHPOA Member
	Stewart McIntosh	BCSLA
	Derek Neale	AIBC
	Judy Ross	Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver

Recording Secretary: Margot Keate West

City Staff: Sailen Black, Development Planner,
Urban Design and Development Planning Centre

Agenda

1. 4:00 **Business** - Review of Minutes of March 17, 2005
2. 4:15 - Panel Member Appointments
3. 4:30 - Recent Projects Update
4. 4:45 **Address 1498 Angus Drive**
 - Applicant: Chris Dikeakos, Architect
 - Landscape Architect: Larry Diamond, Sharp and Diamond Landscape Architecture & Planning
 - Description: After re-consolidation of two lots and demolition of pre-1940's house, construction of a single family residence with 5 vehicle

undergr
ound
garage.

Application: First Review

5. 5:00 Address: **1397 Matthews Avenue**
Applicant: Pat Deluca (owner)
Description: Addition to the garage side and back of this pre-1940's house not on the VHR; raising main floor
Enquiry: Second

1. Business:

Panel Member Appointments:

There are FSAD Panel vacancies for two remaining spaces (both Resident Members at Large). Two applicants have come forward. They are both members of SHPOA, but are not being nominated by SHPOA. The Panel noted that the intention of the new terms of reference was to make room for non-SHPOA members, and not to exclude SHPOA members who wished to fill resident positions. It was noted that the majority of involved residents are members of SHPOA, but that the terms were changed in order to accommodate those who chose not to be members of SHPOA.

New FSAD Panel members requested that planning provide them with copies of the Style Manual (Robert Lemon)*, and update the name placards used during meetings.

Recent Projects Update:

Upcoming applications and enquiries include the following:

- **3890 Alexandra** - Steven Wiedemann will present at next meeting.
- **3890 Angus Drive** - minor alterations will be done without a trip to the Panel. When they decide to go ahead with the proposed construction of their garage, the application will be brought for the Panel to review.
- **3638 Osler Street** - Kingsley Lo - Will be going to the Heritage Commission for next meeting, and will be seen by the Panel next time.
- **1498 Laurier Avenue:** Board of Variance Appeal
The B.o.V. Appeal related to the demand in the Prior-To letter that the applicant not use stamped concrete, as well as the restrictions placed on windows. Planning's wishes regarding the windows were upheld, but the stamped concrete was permitted. This is not expected to be precedent setting, as the specific circumstances were unusual and quite restrictive (ie. An existing condition, below grade, only in the back yard etc.)
- **1909 Hosmer at Cypress** - Margot Innes, Arch. A duroid roof has gone on, but Cedar shingles were specified. The immediate neighbour will be making a complaint for the city to follow up on.

Review of Minutes:

Minutes of March 17th, 2005 were reviewed, and the following changes were made:

Damon Oriente was not present. Michelle McMaster was present.

Bill McCreery was not present. Steve Palmier was present

Page 4 - FSAD Panel questions: "effected" should read "affected."

Motion to approve minutes of March 17, 2005 with noted changes: Moved: Barbara Campney, seconded: Michelle McMaster; Carried unanimously.

* The FSD Historic Style Manual is currently out of print and we are making arrangements to have more printed.

2. Address **1498 Angus Drive**
 Applicant: Chris Dikeakos, Architect
 Landscape Architect: Larry Diamond, Sharp and Diamond Landscape Architecture & Planning
 Description: After re-consolidation of two lots and demolition of pre-1940's house, construction of

a single
 family
 residen
 ce with
 5
 vehicle
 undergr
 ound
 garage

Application: First Review

Changes to the Architecture:

Corner of Angus Drive and Granville Street; Vacant lot. 43,500 sq ft. lot, maximum FSR is 19,000 sq. ft.. Mature trees being retained. Mission revival style, historically accurate but with modern amenities. Towers, colonnades, gable ends, deep reveals, simple forms, deep overhangs, porte-cochere, coach house. Re-using existing driveway cuts. Ramp down to underground garage. Outdoor pool.

Applicant has tried to address FSAD Panel comments from last meeting - Parking has been reduced to 5 vehicle underground garage (original proposal was for 10). Strong symmetry between front door and rotunda at back. Horizontality of front façade has been broken up. 12 ft ceiling height on main floor, 10 feet on second. Slope of roof has been increased.

Asking for a variance for architectural appurtenances (3-4 feet above allowable 35 foot height restriction). Choice of materials - base will be cut granite, heavy timbered details, rough stucco. Banding elements in stucco.

Changes to the Landscape Architecture:

No substantive changes to approach. Retaining major trees. Maintaining existing driveway cuts, porte-cochere in front, secondary porte-cochere on side. Ramp to parking underneath has substantial trellis. Coach house at back will serve as a guest suite. Pool will be a focal point in the garden - tied in to house with pathways etc. Buffer along south and west edges. Permeable surfaces are being considered for a court at back of lot. Smaller indoor pool in rotunda at back of house. Amplifying existing natural landscape with low plantings and flowering shrubs. Trying to carry architectural elements in to garden. South edge metal fence, stone on west with hedge in front, lower stone hedge with metal above on front (north).

Panel Questions:

- Has variance for architectural appurtenances been discussed with staff? Yes, briefly. Staff: good precedence for cupola, tower isn't quite the same, but a good case can be made.
- Engineering driveway cuts? Yes, approved.
- NE corner of porte cochere. Base on North side appears to be stucco - should it be granite? Yes, misdrawn
- Fireplace vent over garage? Direct vent
- Down spouts internal? Copper scuppers and then down spouts become internal
- Columns on trellises are granite, columns on house are stucco? All should be stucco.
- Earlier schemes showed chimneys - none here? No, fireplaces are direct vent. Chimneys could be added to
- Gable ends tied back to house? Not shown on model? Yes.
- Fence interferes with existing trees / root balls? Carrier beam between footings rather than continuous footings can be done to retain trees. Sufficient aggregates.
- Copper? Sealed to remain

Planning Questions:

Is Mission style supported? Is the extra height supported? Screening for east neighbour seems to be addressed. Regarding screening along Granville, has the architect confirmed that a 6 ft. high wall is allowable? There is precedence along Granville for large hedges. How would existing trees along Granville be retained under a new granite wall?

Panel Comments:

Comprehensive design, good presentation. Brighton pavilion like, eccentric design. Complex roof is nice break from last time. Access from Granville should be moved.

Size of balcony over garage is too wide and competes with main entrance. Trim around windows on new drawings appears to be larger than on original. Relationship between addition and original house is a problem - addition is too prominent. Addition needs to be pushed back. Competing elements.

Supportive of landscape in general - in keeping with style of house. Important to maintain filigree of landscaping. Landscape Architect should be present for a formal application. Concerned for number of trees being removed. Full application materials will be required (Arbourist reports, etc.). Nice to see landscape calmer than house. Doesn't compete. Huge house - looks like seminary. Official rather than domestic feel. Plans include a lot of double height spaces - building could be smaller. Happy with way mass has been fragmented. Support height variance. Mission style is perfectly okay - mirrors heritage across street. Needs to be heavy texture stucco - rock dash as opposed to pebble dash. Windows are very attractive, but west elevations - segmented are nice, tall long ones with Juliet balconies. West side are too much of a good thing. Maybe some reticence would work better. Headers should be squared off. If segmented arches could be same proportion throughout and generally elongated in proportion it would be great.

Concern about colouring, wish for sensitivity in keeping it calm (not a bright colour that style can accommodate in other climates). Trellis seems deep in courtyard, makes it seem smaller than it is. Nice to see more lawn, lots of hard surface. Columns on north elevation seem to be floating out in space. Coach house fenestration doesn't relate well to house.

Six ft. wall on Granville is of concern. Legitimate colouring to calm it. Applicant has come along way and thank you for addressing comments from last time. Seems well handled. Driveway near Granville should be moved for safety. Two porte-cocheres is confusing, maybe side entrance could be a porch. Side porte-cochere increases bulk of building. Support relaxation for 6ft. fence if necessary to help with sound and dirt from Granville. Fence detailing - scooped between pillars rather than post and beam. Appurtenances could be lowered if it helps with. Roof forms are overly complex. Fun style, has panache. Consistency of detail. Theatrical. Higher the better for appurtenances. Height restrictions create problems. Consider adding chimneys.

Motion to support with comments addressed. Moved: Richard Keate, Seconded: Maureen Molaro; Carried unanimously.

11. Address: 1397 Matthews Avenue

Applicant: Pat Deluca (owner)

Description: Addition to the garage side and back of this pre-1940's house not on the VHR; raising main floor

Enquiry: Second

Changes to Architecture:

Comments from last time - back of residence has been changed to be more in keeping with front. Changed railings, windows, more symmetrical. Deck/patio levels have changed and back stairs flair. Patio has been reduced from an Italian plaza to something more in keeping with this house. Lower level comes right out onto patio, deck above has been cut back. Windows on front - main floor will remain as is for interior reasons. Shutters on upper floor. Front entrance stairway has been changed. Landscaping is fuller. Set back is in keeping with other examples in neighbourhood.

Changes to Landscape:

Panel Questions:

How many steps up to front door if house is raised? 11. There are a variety of ways to break them up in order to reduce runs. Other possibility is to raise the house only 18". Basement is currently 6' - 6'8". Other way to go is to excavate the basement, although this is labour intensive. Cost comparison? 2/3 of cost of rebuilding from scratch.

Planning Comments:

Planning does not support raising the house, for reasons of technical calculation of height, as well as negative impact on proportion. Planning doesn't support grade manipulation in front yards as a rule (aside from merits of this solution architecturally).

Panel Comments:

Back of garage - flat roof collides with hipped roof over bedroom. Needs careful consideration. Complement owner on listening to and addressing comments from last time. Going in right direction. Difficult proportions on front elevation revolves around height and increase in number of stairs. Relationship between grand staircase and smaller house is odd. Benefit from a simple massing model - sort out roof plan. Simpler shape to house would help. Rear dormer peeking through roof is out of place. Roof material - would be better as cedar. Hard to negotiate added height gracefully. Back is much improved. Stairs have to be treated in sections/ terraces, could whole front garden be raised at sidewalk and sloped up in order to reduce stairs at house. More symmetry at back is good. Windows in a bank is a modern treatment - could one window in family-room/kitchen be removed to give amore traditional feel. Reduced deck is better. Dormer feature added at back should be pulled back to be inline with back wall. Terminus of view - needs to be preserved and improved, not de-valued from neighbourhood perspective and owners' value.

Excavation is better. Proportions are already less than great. Windows need to be lengthened. Biggest problem is garage. Blowing it up with split-level expression of windows. Better pushed back 20 feet. Destroys formality. Base needs to wrap around. Stairs need to be wider in back. 1/3 of way up there needs to be a generous landing. A great architect would solve these problems.

Windows still incorrect proportions. Charming house. Georgian architecture is highly disciplined - rules need to be addressed. Tinkering won't help.

The FSAD Panel wishes to see this again as an application with comments addressed.

Meeting adjourned at 6:05.

Q:\Clerical\UDDPC\05 FSADP\05 minutes fsadp\04.07.fsadp.mins.wpd