



CITY OF VANCOUVER
Community Services Group
Current Planning

QUORUM

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

Minutes of the Meeting of August 11, 2005

Present:	Michael Roburn, Acting Chair	Resident - SHPOA Member
	Barbara Campney	Resident Member at Large
	Kilby Gibson	Resident Member at Large
	Kathy Reichert	Resident Member at Large
	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:	Robert Miranda, Chair	Resident Member at Large
	Beth Noble, Vice-Chair	Resident - SHPOA Member
	Maureen Molaro	Resident - SHPOA Member
Recorded by:	Michael Roburn, Acting Chair	
City Staff:	Sailen Black, Development Planner	
	Urban Design and Development Planning Centre	

AGENDA

- 1. Business:**
 - Review of Minutes of June 30, 2005
 - Recent Projects Update
- 2. Address: 1950 Hosmer Avenue**
 - Applicant:** Jim Bussey, Formwerks Architecture
 - Landscape:** Paul Sangha, Paul Sangha Ltd. (Landscape Architect)
 - Description:** Additions to existing house and reconfiguration of the site plan including landscaping. Modifications to an earlier project seen by FDADP on June 5, 2003 and subsequently approved by the city on March 25, 2004. First Review was on June 30, 2005, when a motion of support was defeated.
 - Application:** Second Review

3. **Address:** 1397 Matthews Avenue
Applicant: Keith Jakobsen, Jakobsen Associates
Landscape: Masa Ito, Ito & Associates
Description: To renovate and add to an existing 1930's Georgian Revival house (not on the VHR) and to construct a four-car detached garage.
Application: First Review
4. **Address:** 3898 Angus Drive
Applicant: John Hollifield, Hollifield Architecture Inc.
Description: Addition to an existing single family residence, which is a pre-1940 building and a former coach house, and building a new carport
Application: Second Review

Meeting called to order at 4:05 pm.

1. Business

Minutes of the meeting of June 30, 2005. Approval was postponed until the next meeting as some members did not have copies. They are to receive them with the next package.

(NOTE: These FSADP minutes had been mailed in a regular small envelope with a copy of the cancellation notice for the July 21 meeting so that Panel members could review them 2 weeks after the meeting, instead of 6 or 9 weeks later if they received them in the package for the next meeting.)

Project Updates:

There are two relatively minor applications which will not come before the Panel:

- 1695 Angus Drive - new gable dormer duplication.
- 1138 Richelieu Avenue - small flat roof addition.

The following addresses will be coming up:

- 1275 Tecumseh Avenue: was seen by the Panel on April 28, 2005, as an enquiry
- 1790 Angus Drive: was seen by the panel on June 9, 2005, as a first enquiry
- 1902 West 19th Avenue,
- 1576 West 16th Avenue.

Windows: The FSD Guidelines say [(4.2.3 (a))] "All windows must be of wood sash construction in keeping with the traditional standard in the area;" The Panel was asked whether metal clad wood windows would be acceptable. The panel was concerned about the implications of this, did not give an opinion and asked to see a sample.

2. **Address:** 1950 Hosmer Avenue; Owner present
Applicant: Jim Bussey, Formwerks Architecture
Landscape: Paul Sangha, Paul Sangha Ltd. (Landscape Architect)
Description: Additions to existing house and reconfiguration of the site plan including landscaping. Modifications to an earlier project seen by FDADP on June 5, 2003 and subsequently approved by the city on March 25, 2004. 1st Review was on June 30, 2005, when a motion of support was defeated.
Application: Second Review

- **Panel Questions :** included concerns about privacy, pool security and hard surface. Safety of the pizza oven and the kitchen - the kitchen will be gas.
- **Planning Comments:** Asked about hard surface, the neighbours' privacy and the separation of some structures. Also asked for comments about compatibility of the proposed addition with the existing house.
- **Panel Comments:** Landscape is an improvement, support change to infill. Doors of kitchen could balance the rear façade. Not sure how details of bay on E relate to the rest of the house. Thanks for more green on the back.
 - Problem is the blip on the back and balconies on either side of it.
 - Delighted to see the canopy go.
 - Support previous comments. External terrace is a pleasant addition. Put mature trees in ASAP to placate the neighbours. There was 5 ft. setback (for pool) before. A full 15 ft. setback would ruin the symmetry of the back yard.
 - Lack of features on the plain wall on the west side of back (the kitchen), safety of the pizza oven from heat of flue to trees above. Happy to see that there is going to be more green.
 - The historical character of the streetscape is the main concern. The new addition restores symmetry which was lost when the west addition was built, but the proposed windows do not match. Recommend that, to maintain symmetry, no oval window be installed on the old extension, that both first floors have similar rectangular windows, and that the second floor on the new extension has two windows to match those on the west extension.

Motion: Proposed by Derek Neale, seconded by Carol Walker Angus: **The Panel supports the application with the Panel's comments addressed. PASSED.** No votes opposing.

Stewart McIntosh asked to be excused from voting.

3. **Address:** 1397 Matthews Avenue; Owner present
Applicant: Keith Jakobsen, Jakobsen, Associates
Landscape: Masa Ito/Ito & Associates
Description: To renovate and add to an existing 1930's Georgian Revival house (not on the VHR) and to construct a four-car detached garage.
Application: First Review; previously seen on March 17 and April 7, 2005

Program:

Previous proposal was reworked addressing many of the Panel's concerns. The house will not be raised. The old garage will be removed and replaced by an extension on the same level as the house, with a family room below. The front porch will be rebuilt with 12" inch columns and matching pilasters. A four car garage is to be built at the back, with a studio above. A sizeable addition to be built at the back.

The building will be completely screened from the house on the east side by very tall and dense evergreen trees. It will also be partly screened by trees from the house on the west. The lot is very deep. There will be a full width green area at the back with a substantial lawn (Acting Chair's comment - this is a treed area at the present time). The planned impermeable areas are 3% more than allowable, which will have to be reduced. The herb garden is not worked out yet.

Panel Questions:

Will any trees be removed?
 Asphalt shingles on the roof?
 Sunken patio?

Planning Comments:

Planning is asking for the Panel's comments on: the raised area in front; hot tub and gazebo location and design; amount of non-planted area, the character of alterations; the character of the addition; and the character of the garage.

Panel Comments:

- New addition - a little uncomfortable with the little roof - one roof better. Little flat roof on the garage a little odd. Don't support asphalt shingles, do support permeable pavers all areas. Railings to rear don't match cross bars at flat roof.
- Interior plans very successful. Too many porches. Make the west one different. Make one roof, no flat roof on the garage. Avoid cricket, match roof pitches. Draw minimal manoeuvring space with minimal hammerhead to get more planting in.
- Instead of looking at the 3% impermeable, better to reduce hard surface to planting. Seems to be broken up. Want to see it back again. Confusing, what entrances are meant to be main ones? Do like the progressions of one area to another.
- Agree with changes to façade. Think it works well, especially making the old garage into new part of the house. Glad the house is not raised. More planting in driveway. Hot tub feels very crowded, esp. in relation to stairs. The edge between lawn and courtyard is abrupt, could there be more interactions in line with the edge of the garage.
- My compliments. Like the front façade. Agree with comments about flat roof on office. Really big concern is that on the west side next to the house will be shaded and crowded. Too many porches and decks. Maybe on north end. No real room for table and chairs. 5 ft. below grade.

- Instead of 3% excess hard surface, better to reduce it down with planting.
- Way too much concrete; Want more green. Don't like long driveway with garage (Acting Chair's comment: the guidelines approve a garage at the back at the end of a long drive. The garage will be over 100 ft. from the street).
- Support linking roofs - two rooflines are OK. Regret loss of bonnet. Façade as presented is fine. Garage door should be body colour. Too much hard surface. Regret loss of tree in driveway. East side harsh, need to create greenery. Explore symmetry with at least two trees. Asphalt shingles - would like to see cedar, but there are marauding raccoons. Want to see landscape back.
- Garage door to be same as house. Like the streetscape - addition centres the house on the lot. The small flat roof on the garage is unsightly.
- Like the change to façade. West yard walk - have plantings instead. Much improved, like the front. Do away with flat roof on office. Accept addition. Too much hard surface. Like the house. Two rooflines are OK.

Motion: The Panel was not ready for a motion of support. Proposed by Stewart McIntosh, seconded by Richard Keate:

The Panel would like the applicant to come back. PASSED. No votes opposing.

4. **Address:** 3898 Angus Drive; Owner present
Applicant: John Hollifield, Hollifield Architect Inc.
Description: Addition to an existing single family residence, a pre-1940 building and a former coach house, and a new carport
Application: **First Review** Project was seen by the panel on June 30, 2005. The panel requested to see the project again, primarily because of the carport and landscaping, not with the addition to the residence.

Program:

The carport is a garden structure. Attempted to make it "disappear". It will be a painted steel structure. The metal screen at the back of the carport will have punched square holes. Prefer the driveway to be hard, not gravel as considered before. Will do their best to protect the beech tree. The concrete fountain, which is close to the tree, will be removed.

Planning Comments:

The position of driveway relative to maples and street trees still unresolved.

Panel Comments:

- The metal screen at the back of the carport would make it look like an industrial structure. Recommend horizontal cedar, not flat steel. Retain steel frame, but have lattice (in front).
- No problem with location. Prefer landscape location of driveway. Perforated metal very flat, maybe OK. Wood will have depth.
- Reluctant to support. Not enough info on garage, no arborist's report. Garage is not a garden structure yet. Architecture not FSD but appealing. Opposed to new driveway, esp. as concrete.
- Project is OK. Garage location makes sense
- Would support if garage can be softened and made more garden-like.
- Add trim board to closet dormer. More wood on garage.
- Would support dark sash colour and metal as support. Would like permeable driveway surface.
- Low roof on garage better for neighbours. Don't like the dormer, but realize that removing it would mean some demolition. The north maple in front is very bad, the south tree only a bit better, and it encroaches on a boulevard tree.

Motions: Proposed by Stewart McIntosh, seconded by Carol Walker Angus:

Support architectural features as shown, with comments addressed. PASSED, no votes opposing.

Proposed by Richard Keate, seconded by Carol Walker Angus: **Support the application as shown with the Panel's comments addressed. PASSED with one vote opposing.**

Meeting adjourned at 7:33 pm.