



First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

Minutes of the Meeting of June 30, 2005

Present:	Robert Miranda, Chair	Resident Member at Large
	Barbara Campney	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
	Steve Palmier	AIBC
	Richard Keate	Heritage Commission Representative
	Judy Ross	Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver

Regrets/Absences:

Beth Noble, Vice-Chair	Resident - SHPOA Member
Kilby Gibson	Resident Member at Large

Recording Secretary: Louise Christie, Admin. Assistant, UDDPC

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

AGENDA

1. 4:00 Business;
 - Review of the Minutes of June 9, 2005
 - Recent Project Update

2. 4:15 **Address: 1599 Angus Drive**
 Applicant: Alan Main, Paul Sangha Ltd.
 Description: New pool, terrace, and accessory buildings in the rear of this existing single family residence
 Application: First Review

3. 4:45 **Address: 3898 Angus Drive**
 Applicant: John Hollifield, Hollifield Architect Inc.
 Description: Renovation and addition to an existing single family residence, a pre-1940s building
 Application: First Review

4. 5:15 **Address: 1950 Hosmer Avenue**
 Applicant: Jim Bussey, Formwerks Architectural Incorporated
 Description: Additions to existing house and reconfiguration of site plan, including landscaping. Modifications to an earlier project seen by FSAD Panel on June 5, 2003 and subsequently approved by the City on March 25, 2004.
 Application: First Review

NOTE: On the Agenda, items 3 & 4 were listed as enquiries but they were applications.

1. Business

The usual recording secretary, Margot Keate-West, gave birth to a healthy boy and will no longer be doing the FSAD Panel minute taking. Members, especially new ones, were encouraged to volunteer. The Chair thanked staff for seeing that the minutes are produced for this meeting.

- **Minutes of June 9, 2005** were reviewed. The following changes were to project updates: The incorrect address was given and the correct one is **3398 Cypress Street** for the project of Pete Rose, Architect. The motion was to approve minutes with change noted: Moved: Steward McIntosh; Seconded: Carol Walker-Angus. Carried unanimously.

Project updates:

- **1275 Tecumseh;** Oblate Community Residence: No application has been made; Still at schematic stage.
- **1098 Wolfe:** In notification stage.
- **1790 Angus Drive:** To infill Heritage 'A" dealing with basic issues of property division

At this time, there are no firm enquiries for future projects.

Note: Stewart McIntosh is in conflict with 1599 Angus Drive and 1950 Hosmer Avenue. He will stay in the meeting but make no comments.

2. **Address:** **1599 Angus Drive**
 Applicant: Alan Main and Paul Sangha of Paul Sangha Ltd. (Landscape Architects)
 Description: New pool, terrace, and accessory buildings in the rear of this existing single family residence
 Application: First Review

Program:

The Landscape Architect, Alan Main, discussed the way they dealt with the issue of too much site coverage and not enough green space. The same layout was kept and everything was reduced in size, from 56 ft. x 25 ft. to 50 ft. by 20 ft. for the swimming pool. Materials are the same as on the house, mostly limestone with slate roof. Sculptural fountains are cascading into the pool. There is a 16 ft. hedge which is virtually invisible from around the property as the neighbouring house to the north has an 8 ft. retaining wall.

Panel Questions:

- In terms of hard surface, is this approvable? In terms of FSR, the house was built approximately 310 sq. ft. below the approved maximum. A question arose because the Development Permit plans were pulled at application and the DE was at full FSR, but in the Building Permit, the building was undersized so there is adequate FSR left.
- There is a concern that the lower property to the north may have problems with the large amount of hard surface. Where will the rain water go? There is existing rain water retention tank. Keen Engineering has said it doesn't need to be made bigger.
- What materials are used for the hard surfaces? Around the pool edges is smooth tinted concrete and the panels are slate. It may change to limestone with slate. The Portuguese limestone on the house is very light and there is a concern about staining. The pool does use ozone. Glass blocks for edge of the pool are being considered.
- What is 'jaddish' slate? It is slate quarried in South America.

Planning Comments: This scheme appears to respond to earlier FSAD Panel comments.

Panel Comments:

One member said that, though it was originally presented as a Tuscan House, it is certainly acceptable under the guidelines. Another, that the reduction in size of the pool was good and the geometry relates to the asymmetry of the house. Some Panel members expressed a concern that there was still too much slate and concrete and not enough permeable area - there should be more green and less grey. Comments were made that the dark slate could be hot to walk on and might be dangerous and slippery around the pool when wet. On the other had, there were opinions that a good balance between solid and grass areas had been achieved and, as the layout was not going to affect streetscape, it was fine. The applicant was complimented on a beautiful presentation, noting that it is usually an indication that the project is well designed.

Response:

The project was supported unanimously.

3. **Address:** 3898 Angus Drive
Applicant: John Hollifield, Hollifield Architect Inc.
Landscape Architect: Ron Rule, Ronald Rule Consultants Ltd.
Description: Renovation and addition to an existing single family residence, a pre-1940s building.
Application: First review

Program:

The Architect, John Hollifield, reviewed this application for an addition and changes to the landscaping. The placement of this older building, originally associated with the MacClure House next door, is non-conforming at back of the lot. The proposal is for a minor addition of 270 sq. ft. The design requires a relaxation to rear yard; it is encroaching slightly into the back yard but an addition on the front would require a redesign. A new parking structure and repositioned driveway is also proposed. Currently, the driveway takes up a huge amount of the yard with concrete and the change would angle the view into the house for arrivals, and be made of permeable gravel. There is a beautiful copper beach tree which sits in the centre north of the property which influenced where the garage was placed. Moving the driveway to the north is the least intrusive way to do it and creates a much better garden space in the front of the yard. A portion of the house, the dining room, is being extended out. This space will be glazed. The windows will be new and are proposed as true divided light windows. The architecture is in keeping with that of the house. The stone walls are existing.

Landscaping: The Landscape Architect, Ron Rule, presented the landscape drawings. The new road alignment allows for more privacy and a more expansive garden. The intention is to preserve the beautiful copper beach to the north and the magnolia. The driveway will be gravel, edged with concrete. The two existing maple trees are hazardous so they will be removed, which will allow for more west light to get into the garden. The entrance is lightly screened. Outside the eating area, there is a small patio. The main patio area is three steps down from the living room, complete with fireplace and barbecue. Another patio on the east side gets good morning light. Some of the existing rhododendrons will be used for screening purposes. The big lawn will be very private and have good light exposure. A variety of outdoor patio areas take advantage of the placement of the house.

Panel Questions:

- Material on the south side is pretty bland so why is it used? The wood siding on the lower level already exists and goes around to the north, then turns into granite on the lower half. Once the addition is put in, the rest of the dormer will change from siding to stucco.
- How far does the stone wall go along the edge of the property and are you planning to extend it to the street edge? Yes, as there is an existing wall that matches the neighbours in the front and it will be changed when the driveway is moved to match that of the McClure residence next door. The ironwork would be reconnected.
- What is the condition of the wall? It is in good shape.
- Materials on the carport? It will be the same stain as the ½ tempering - grey blue
- Roof material? Gravel to match the driveway.
- Is the front entry door new? Reuse the existing door with the big iron-work knocker.
- Is the carport made of slats? It is an open car port for a sense security. The slats fit into a steel grid.
- Why is the carport roof flat and not peaked? To form the peak in keeping with that of the house would require a much larger form and it would be too imposing. It could not be a match because of the height allowance for auxiliary buildings. The preference is for a more see-through structure that blends in with the garden.
- Is there a reason why, at the front entrance to the house, it appears crowded on the landscape plan? They are small trees and there is actually good space between them.
- Will the gravel paving system for the driveway allow water to percolate? Yes, as it is pervious.
- Can you burn wood and gas in the fireplace barbecue? No, just gas. There is a gas fireplace and a connection for the barbecue.
- Why do you prefer a carport to an open garage, where bikes, etc. will be visible? The owner feels safer when there is a clear view through and nothing will be stored in there but a few tools.
- Doesn't gravel cause problems? On a flat site, there are layers of gravel with fine pebbles on the top.
- How do you rake the leaves from the birch tree? Use a leaf blower

- What kind of assurances do you have from the arborist? A large elm and another beech on the McClure property make a forested setting. Everything possible will be done to keep the beech tree healthy. An arborist's report will be submitted with the application.
- Do you actually need the little addition on the end of the house? It is a former addition of a closet from about 30 years ago. It is already roofed so it would cost a lot to take it away.

Planning Comments: Planning would like the Panel comments on the character of the new garage and to hear discussion about additional square footage. The Director of Planning is prepared to relax rear yard setbacks if they get positive response from the neighbours and the FSAD Panel.

Panel Comments:

The Panel's comments were generally favourable concerning the addition to the house. From a heritage standpoint, it was good the house was being retained as it is undersize for the lot. The addition enhances the residence with the attractive colour scheme of grey to augment the tone of the stone, making it look more traditional. The fenestration lightens the façade, but it is not totally traditional. The mock Tudor framing and new gables are successful giving an English countryside feel with the country garden. On the other hand, the overall concept was pleasing but it might be better to just take it off the dormer and have one angle to work with to be more aesthetically pleasing. The previous addition of the closet should be removed. The location of the front door is ambiguous and a strongly defined edge is needed to guide the guest to the front door.

Concerning the carport, the Panel's comments varied. The steel and wood slat carport with the flat roof against the Tudor feeling of the house was found interesting but also seen as a modern building set up against a Tudor doll's house. Some thought the carport should match the house as the new addition does but others felt that it wasn't necessary to always have to design in the style of the existing house. Strong opinions were expressed that the modern carport did not fit but perhaps with a gable roof, to look like an arbour that had been glassed in, or if a strong case was made, the Panel would feel more comfortable with the flat roof. A Panel member thought the introduction of steel is appropriate because of the detailing which is consistent with the new addition to the house. It works and livens things up. Another suggestion was that the flat tar and gravel roof should be greened, which does not necessarily have to be grass, because of the overview of the neighbours.

The Panel was pleased with the landscaping. Overall the siting & proposals for the garden are good, particularly increasing the amount of lawn and permeable surface. The gravel driveway is reminiscent of France and is good from the point of security (but will trash wood floors in the house). Though the intent is to save the beech tree it may not be practical. An arborist's report will look at the previous use around the tree, with the pool and fountain being replaced by driveway and the applicant will do all they can for the tree to be as healthy as possible.

Response:

It is not an enquiry but a review. Most of the Panel would like to see it again, primarily because of the carport and landscaping, not with the addition to the residence. Their concern is with the detailing of the carport. The project will return as a second review.

4. **Address:** 1950 Hosmer Avenue
Applicant: Jim Bussey, Formwerks Architectural Incorporated
Landscape: Paul Sangha, Paul Sangha Ltd. (Landscape Architect)
Description: Additions to existing house and reconfiguration of site plan, including landscaping. Modifications to an earlier project seen by FSAD Panel on June 5, 2003 and subsequently approved by the City on March 25, 2004.
Application: First review

Program:

The Architect, Jim Bussey, began by showing the orientation of the project to the heavily treed Hosmer Avenue. There is an addition proposed to the east side of the existing house to reflect a conservatory with an ensuite bathroom next to the master bedroom directly above which was added previously. The infill, a swimming pool changing room with office space and rec-room features, was approved last year. With this site configuration, the house didn't have to be torn down. A larger garage was also approved. An outdoor kitchen was approved but moved to the back of the lot. A small addition is also made off the back. It is not visible from the street. The materials are entirely in keeping with the main house.

The Landscape Architect, Paul Sangha, reviewed the landscape drawings. The plan is to retain the stone wall along the front facing Hosmer Avenue with a curvilinear wall inside. Stone walls flank the driveway but there is an attempt to reduce the width of driveway by introducing planting on the sides and to create a courtyard area at the end. The layout of the garden is on access with the pool off of the kitchen and dining room. The main house is very transparent to the street so the proposal is to add paperbark maples, magnolias, and dogwoods for a screening effect. With the additional trees, the coach house becomes a secondary building that you see through the landscaping. It is the main entertainment space and has a courtyard with double fireplace. The outdoor kitchen was approved in a different location but the axis of the pool was changed so that it would receive more sunlight and this small infill building was moved to the back by the hot tub.

Panel Questions:

- Why don't these other buildings have rooflines that match the house? The ends are flared to give it more garden type quality. Because of the upstairs room and height, the head of the windows would have to be lowered too much without the flare of the roofline.
- This site has been under construction for 7 years. When you look from the street to the back, will the landscaping make a difference? When the landscaping matures it will make a difference.
- There appears to be a discrepancy between the elevation and the plan? Pitched roof to balcony and the balcony running across the front of the house, behind the pitched roof. The guard rail will have to turn back into the building.
- What is right - the pitched roof or flat surface? Both. The wall with rail on top so there are 2 balconies. The plan and the elevation are incorrect in 2 different ways but will be corrected.
- Will the guard rail be wood? No, wrought iron.
- What will the entertainment terrace be constructed of? An Aberdeen limestone with a dark charcoal border.
- What is the height of the hedges? The proposal is to have a filtered view from the street and then to give privacy to the residence. There is a neighbouring wall of 4 to 4.5 ft. Plantings will be broad-leaf evergreens 5 to 6 feet on top of that. On the south side, there is a significant grade change to the next neighbour, relatively sunken in back and elevated in front. The trees on the neighbouring property present a backdrop.
- Is the courtyard garden solid? It is the same sand stone and all the joints are planted so it has a softer appearance.
- Is the driveway being torn out? It is gravel and will be replaced with a true grey cobble stone. At the end it will change to a courtyard of limestone so there is a sense of arrival.
- How will rainwater be dealt with? There will be a storage tank.
- Will there be a permeable cover for the driveway that had been discussed before? That was previous to this design proposal.
- What is the landscaping on Hosmer Avenue in front of the infill? It is all grass.
- Is there any grass at the back? There are bushes around the perimeter and hard surface up the driveway.

- 10 years ago, the main bulk of the house was on the west side, and the only bump out was a one storey entrance facing on the driveway. Then 2-storeys were added on the west side. Recently, there was an addition of a covered porch on the driveway side.
- If this is accepted, what is the completion date on this? This is not possible to determine.

Point of Order: Derek Neale suggested that if there are members of Panel receiving a letter from the City as part of the notification process, they could reply directly to the City but the duty of the FSAD Panel is to review in light of the guidelines. This committee addresses issues of design.

Planning Comments: The Development Planner pointed out that, at this point, a set of plans was being reviewed. Planning would like comments on the effect of the changed position of the small infill and pool orientation, and the possible impacts on privacy, noise, views, overlooks, etc.

Panel Comments:

The Chair requested that the Panel members focus on the guidelines when making their comments.

The Panel was generally impressed with the quality and geometry of the landscape plan but there was an issue with the amount of impermeable coverage of the site. Drainage could be a serious issue as there is quite a slope. One member liked the change of surface from the front to the back, but others said that the all hard surface area would become a heat trap and lawn should be extended into the back. If the garage and infill were pushed back, it would bring back the proportions of the lot. The new plan was preferred working with the slope up from the front so that with the proper tree planting, the view from the street will be improved. It is unfortunate that so many of the mature trees and rhododendrons were removed without going through the City permit process because this seems to have foreshortened the lot. The strong enclosure of the side yard garden will eventually encourage an estate feel although it was thought this feeling was lost with the sense that there is building from corner to corner on the lot. It was noted that there is development nearly to the back property line and the buildings are almost encroaching on all the setbacks. The rotation of the pool has changed the overall geometry of the layout and for some Panel members this was very detrimental to the original axis of the plan. The view from the living room is now the summer kitchen and the view from dining room is the hot tub and they should have a significant focal point. The hot tub may have privacy issues, both from the neighbours overview and possible noisiness being a disturbance. The size of the site could allow 2 infills but the design was not pleasing and in allowing the kitchen cabana to move, there should be more grass planted as a trade-off.

More than one Panel member regretted the loss of what was a beautifully proportioned heritage house, which should be elegant but is now higher and wider. The large canopy on the infill appeared bigger than that on the main house but the architect said it was the FSAD Panel that requested a canopy to mirror the main house when he had not wanted one.

A discrepancy between plan and elevations was pointed out. One member didn't care for balconies on a Georgian house, which appear very weak when at the other end there is nice detailing on the bay window. Wooden spindles might be more appropriate than metal rails on a Georgian style house. Some years ago the west side was added onto so the proposed addition will restore balance but it is quite different, with the proposed windows not being asymmetrical. Objection was expressed to the oval window shown on the west side which was not presented to the Panel originally but was approved by the City. There is a small porch on the west side so it was suggested that a small roof over the door on the east side would help with balancing.

Response:

There are no issues with aspects of privacy because the property behind has 100 ft. tall hemlocks. The pool has been turned in this proposal because it was in the shade and the intention is to have more sun shining on it. From property line, the pool is 3 ft. deeper. To improve the view of the hot tub, there is to be a wall fountain that circulates the water. With the walls, it read as one large space so the proposal is to achieve a sense of courtyard with a stone wall that wraps around behind it. The kids and family are going to be using the coach house for recreation space. With the overhangs of buildings, circulation of the pedestrian traffic of families with children that frequent the yard, grassing areas becomes more limited. The landscape is to give as green an impression as possible. The property is currently naked and this is not acceptable so the approach is one of

reforestation with a filtered and layered look to be achieved. The pool is more of a reflective pool as relative to the axis.

The Panel was asked what they are looking for by the architect.

- There was concern with what is being presented in elevations as they were not correct. Drawings need to be precise.
- The Panel did not agree on which pool orientation was best.

The architect reminded the Panel that, as the original house was small, they had considered tearing it down to build a new one of adequate size, approximately 13, 000 sq. ft.. Doing cost checking and having the owner reconsider priorities in life, the decision was made to keep the house as it was rather nice. When they were discussing the possibility of a pool, the idea came up of the infill house for the office and recreational activities. This was formerly appreciated by the Panel as the residence is small compared to what could have been built on the site. Now, new decisions by the owner are taking a lot of time as there are many minutia to be considered before each one is finalized. Once the site is planted up, there won't be much to see from the street. There will be substantial trees and in the future they could be a backdrop to infill houses on the lot beside.

Motion: It was moved by Michelle McMaster to support the application; seconded by Derek Neale. It was not supported by the Panel with 7 against. The Panel would like the project to return with Panel comments addressed.

Meeting adjourned at 6:30 pm.