



CITY OF Vancouver
Community Services Group
Current Planning

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

Minutes of the Meeting of June 9, 2005

Present:

Robert Miranda, Chair	Resident Member at Large
Barbara Campney	Resident Member at Large
Kilby Gibson	Resident Member at Large
Kathy Reichert	Resident Member at Large
Maureen Molaro	Resident - SHPOA Member
Michael Roburn	Resident - SHPOA Member
Carole Walker Angus	Resident - SHPOA Member
Stewart McIntosh	BCSLA
Michelle McMaster	BCSLA
Derek Neale	AIBC
Richard Keate	Heritage Commission Representative
Judy Ross	Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver

Regrets/Absences:

Beth Noble, Vice-Chair	Resident - SHPOA Member
Steve Palmier	AIBC

Recording Secretary: Margot Keate West

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

AGENDA

- 1. Business**
 - Review of Minutes of May 19, 2005
 - Recent Projects Update
- 2. Address: 1902 West 18th Avenue**
 - Applicant:** Jim Bussy, Formwerks Architectural
 - Description:** Demolition of a post-1940s residence and construction of a new single family residence with detached garage
 - Enquiry:** First
- 3. Address: 1790 Angus Drive**
 - Applicant:** James Emery, Iredale Group Architecture and Engineering
 - Description:** To discuss alternatives for infill around this Heritage "A" listed residence.
 - Enquiry:** First

1. Business

Minutes of May 19th, 2005 were reviewed, and were approved as presented

Moved: Barbara Campney. Seconded: Carole Walker Angus. Carried unanimously.

Project updates:

- **3398 Cypress Street:** Project by Pete Rose, Architect for an addition to the rear of this residence is totally in keeping with guidelines and outright use. Work will proceed without review from FSADP.
- **Contemporary Architecture:** A Panel member raised the question of whether or not the FSAD Panel needs clarification from the city on the use of contemporary architectural styles within FSD and whether or not it conflicts with the mandate of the Panel to retain “pre- 1940’s character”. Planning asked if a majority of Panel members feel that further discussion/direction is required. The Panel felt that the reason for a 14 member Panel is to interpret the guidelines, and that receiving further instruction from the City would reduce the possibilities for innovative architecture in FSD. The concern of the Panel member who raised this question was withdrawn.
- **1950 Hosmer Avenue:** There is continued concern about the roof lines and other changes to the approved plans for the accessory buildings. Planning will pull the approved plans and minutes for review.

2. **Address:** 1902 West 18th Avenue
Applicant: Jim Bussy, Formwerks Architectural
Description: Demolition of a post-1940s residence and construction of a new single family residence with detached garage
Enquiry: First

Program:

Existing post-1940 split level bungalow at Cypress & 18th Avenue. New house will be oriented towards Cypress Street, but setbacks will remain as they are: Cypress frontage will be 15 feet from property line, West 18th Avenue will be 30 feet. Proposal is to build a new symmetrical, classical house. Great site for this type of architecture. Axial plan, 2 stories high. Orders & principles of classical architecture will be adhered to, with slightly relaxed accessory buildings (exposed rafter tails, etc. - more west coast). Green house/eating area at centre back. Landscape will be in French tradition - gravel lawn, casual elegance in combination with rigours of classical landscape forms. Outdoor rooms - boxwood and gravel. Strong base, careful attention to fenestration patterns / solid to void ratios. Eyebrow window on roof. Informal entry on side of house, porte-cochere element (detached with garage behind). Gated secondary exit to lane will allow for ease of circulation. Interesting axial floorplan. Two-storey spaces inside, skylights on back. No wandering windows - very ordered. Washroom, changing room for pool will be attached to the garage. Driveway paving will continue in to garage for party use.

Panel Questions:

- Porte-cochere isn't attached? Variance required for side yard setbacks in order to be allowed to attach it. Underground parking isn't feasible on this site. Grand allee of trees will lead from Cypress to garage, beautiful gates, sense of procession - not trying to hide cars/parking, but trying to treat it in as picturesque a way as possible.
- Why is house facing Cypress Street? No requirement either way. Cypress address is better; other houses on Cypress are better. Plan works better oriented this way.
- Front yard setback? 30 ft. - north wall of house is sitting on front yard setback. Cypress façade is set back 15 feet. This configuration allows for both lawn and pool.
- Lot size and FSR? - 100X125, FSR isn't maxed out.
- Impermeable surface? Not yet calculated.
- Could garage face lane? Yes, but not beneficial - wouldn't carry the weight in terms of streetscape and classical design. Of visual interest the way it's been designed.
- Materials? Prefer to do it in limestone. Heavy rock-dash stucco is the usual treatment. Third option would be painted brick. Ariscraft could be 4th option.
- Precedents/examples in FSD? Villa Russe on The Crescent. Classically designed architecture that has been English-ified exists throughout FSD.
- Trees along driveway? 20 feet, pleached (raised hedge on sticks).
- Paving? Not at that level of detail yet. Cobblestone would be nice.

Planning Comments:

Amount of hard surface in relation to soft landscaping is of concern. Interested in Panel's reaction to style. Amount of non-green surfacing, as well as technical permeable surface concerns.

Panel Comments:

Appreciate seeing this early. Presentation materials need to be related to Shaughnessy guidelines. Examples are needed. Depth of detail, massing don't immediately say FSD. Somewhat boxy response to guidelines. Sun/site planning don't seem to work together. Pool is in a less than desirable spot, sunroom has large roof over it; best spot is taken up by parking considerations. Orientation isn't helpful in this regard. Driveway - 3.5 of guidelines: "axial view down long straight driveway straight through to coach house can provide attractive sight lines". This plan works in this regard. Pool is in okay spot. Balances what's across the street. More depth needed to take on FSD flavour. Materials - limestone isn't appropriate, stucco (particularly rock-dash) is good - classical arch. in FSD tends to be rusticated. 1529 W. 36th Avenue is painted brick and looks great. Eyebrow window over dormer is great as long as it's fully integrated into roof. Take cues from pre-date houses in Shaughnessy. Too much impermeable surface. Cobble stone driveway sounds nice. Massing in relation to neighbours would be good to see. Hard surface area appears too great. Too close to street - needs more green. French doors might be a security concern. Feels pinched - house is too close to front lawn. House seems

large for the lot - crowded. Don't necessarily object to closeness to Cypress, but would be interested in detailing of front garden. Porte-cochere is a problem being unattached - better as greenspace. Maybe a lighter structure - metal. Twenty feet isn't enough to make driveway feel like an allee. Elegant house, not English - but it doesn't have to be. Desire of guidelines to enforce a limited visible presence of automobiles isn't helped by porte-cochere. Landscape draws more attention than principle building. Entrance to house is secondary to car entrance. Landscape plan is needed before Panel can react reasonably. Thanks for coming in early. Needs to be attached to guidelines more specifically. Doesn't have to look like other FSD buildings but points of similarity need to be brought out and addressed. Landscape architect should be retained soon. Sense of filigree between house and street would go a long way.

Carport/ porte-cochere needs to be softened. Perhaps another type of structure with more green to it would be better. There are two facades on this house - North façade needs to address street better. Like concept. Some interesting ideas, but not all of them work on this lot. Architecture seems a bit fussy as shown. Allee is too short to work.

Response:

Guidelines talk about most interesting houses in FSD being those that show renaissance classical symmetry (Hycroft, Hollies, Villa Russe etc.), although majority are a-symmetrical and of the English picturesque tradition. This house is striving to be one of the former. Applicants have looked at the siting very carefully, and given size of street trees, this plan works best. One car in porte-cochere could be attractive, as long as driveway is handled well. Stately, grand procession. Allee could be up to 25 feet. Massing is bulky on site, but still under FSR. Partially based on villa built as an infill in Toronto - can be beautifully done even under size constraints. Urban setting, urban lot. By turning house to Cypress Street, frontage has increased to 125' - allows more room for driveway. Porte-cochere is practical in Vancouver. More desirable to have a surface garage that is visually interesting rather than underground.

3. **Address:** 1790 Angus Drive
Applicant: James Emery, Iredale Group Architecture and Engineering
Description: To discuss alternatives for infill around this Heritage "A" listed residence.
Enquiry: First

Program: Very preliminary stage. Heritage "A" house. Proposal is to add an infill residence on to large 33000 sq. ft lot. Identified in 1992 plan as an appropriate site for infill. Original house designed by A.A. Cox, built 1912. Existing owners interested in building infill home for themselves, and selling original 9000 sq. ft. house. Not feasible to move house (brick bearing wall up to 2nd story). Main house is set near back of lot on a hill. Driveway cut on east will be retained, but with relocated second entrance addressing new coach house towards west side of lot.

Panel Questions:

- Subdivision or strata? Could be either. Fee simple subdivision would be preferable. 13000 sq ft lot could be subdivided for infill, with main house retaining 20000.
- Apart from moving house are there other options? No. Expanding existing garage into a coach house is less desirable and difficult from a strata/subdivision point of view.
- Dimensions: 220' on front, 229' deep on east, 99' at back and 203' on West.
- Max infill is 3000 sq. ft., and at rear or side of existing building? Siting of main house is dictating an unconventional approach to this property. Normally, a lot of this size could accommodate two 3000 sq ft. infills.
- Typical frontage along Angus Drive? Technically, lots have to be 100 ft. Existing frontages vary, but this is one of the largest.
- Subdivision lines? Needs to be 13000 sq. ft. but bit at back of infill lot could be easement-ed back to main house.
- Infill setback? 30 feet from street.
- HRA or designation? Heritage planning would seek designation and possibly an HRA in return for variances needed to do this infill.

Planning Comments: Planning hasn't seen this proposal before. Previous proposal with expanded coach-house at rear had obvious drawbacks. Highly desirable to retain this heritage house.

Panel Comments: Best to leave existing house alone and sited where it is. A new building has to work around this. Siting presented seems like best option. Property needs to be treated as a whole, and infill has to relate very strongly to main house. Like the idea - house is very stately, but doesn't relate to street well. Coach house or gate house tucked off to one side might make property friendlier from the street. Same number of driveway cuts, retention of mature garden. Would be worth pursuing. Landscaping around infill will be key to making this read well. New building should relate very strongly to main house stylistically. Driveway for new building suggests underground parking. An obvious ramp down to below grade parking would destroy the effect. Like to see further development of this plan. Support hinges on stylistic relationship to main house. Underground parking would be extremely detrimental. Infill needs to look small, not bulked up by parking. Subdivision (1205 Matthews Avenue) turned down by approving officer because it interrupted module of streetscape. Owner should be wary. Needs to be approached in relation to heritage structure. Size and design of infill - coach house, stable, gatehouse. Secondary building can't exceed 3000 sq. ft. 1490 Matthews Avenue and 3583-3589 Angus Drive (Grauer house) are both good examples of proportion of infill to main house. On infill plan, bump out towards driveway is disturbing. Looks like suburbs where primary access is through garage. Matthews Avenue - Greencroft infill is objectionable to many - it's been bulked up to accommodate garage. Get garage out of sight. Reduce bulk. Pretty clear that infills should be built to the side and rear. Author of guidelines said to be romantic in your response to the guidelines, and the calibre and siting of this house require this approach. Main house must be prominent in every respect. Don't proceed too far without getting some firm direction from the city.

Response:

12 foot drop from front of existing house to street. Underground parking for infill could come off street at grade and end up under building with very little drop.

Meeting adjourned at 6:00

Q:\Clerical\UDDPC\05 FSADP\05 minutes fsadp\06.09.mins.fsadp.doc