



CITY OF VANCOUVER

COMMUNITY SERVICES
Planning Department
Current Planning

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

Minutes of the Meeting of February 24, 2005

Present:	Robert Miranda (Chair) Beth Noble (Vice-Chair) Michael Roburn Carole Walker Angus Barbara Campney Stewart McIntosh Derek Neale Bill McCreery Richard Keate Judy Ross	Resident - Member at Large Resident - SHPOA Member Resident - SHPOA Member Resident - SHOPA Member Resident - Member at Large BCSLA AIBC AIBC Heritage Commission Representative Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver
Regrets/Absences:	Maureen Molaro Damon Oriente	Resident - SHPOA member BCSLA
Recording Secretary:	Margot Keate West	
City Staff:	Sailen Black, Development Planner,	UDDPC

Agenda

- 1. Business:**
 1. Review of Minutes of December 9, 2004 and January 13, 2005;
 2. FSAD Panel Member Appointments; and
 3. Recent Projects Update
- 4. Address: 1690 Matthews Avenue**

Applicant: Roger Bayley, Merrick Architecture
Description: Canuck Place - 'A' Heritage Designation: Redevelopment of the care facility building, addition of a new annex building and creation of an underground parking garage. **NOTE:** Drawings are block diagrams - not representative of the orientation or actual shape of the future building.
Enquiry: First
- 5. Address: 1098 Wolfe Avenue**

Applicant: Clinton Cuddington
Description: Demolition of a post-1940s house and construction of a single family residence and with garage below, green building features and landscape alterations
Enquiry: Second
- 6. Address: 1398 The Crescent**

Applicant: Keith Jakobsen, Jakobsen Associates
Description: 'B' Heritage Designation: Proposed new guest house, garage, swimming pool, nanny's quarters and pizza oven in rear yard, and new landscaping in front yard. Some work already in progress.
Enquiry: Second

1. Business:

2. FSAD Panel Member Appointments: Panel vacancies have been advertised. So far there have been 2 nominations for SHPOA resident positions, 1 for at-large resident (one more needed), one for the AIBC, and one

for the BCSLA positions. FSAD Panel members will speak with other residents to try to find another applicant for the remaining resident position.

3. Recent Projects Update: Upcoming applications and enquiries include the following:

- 3890 Alexandra - Stephen Wiedemann;
- 3898 Angus - John Hollifield (minor additions – will likely proceed without FSAD Panel review)
- 1498 Angus – Chris Dikeakos: coming back as first review next time
- 1833 W. 17th Ave. - Wisen Interiors (Inactive - client is designing in RS-5)
- 1498 Laurier – Stephen Sinclair (HRA in process) coming up in March for public hearing
- 3638 Osler – Kingsley Lo - Letter written to chair by applicant regarding siting of house and additions
- 1707 Angus Dr. - Richard Kadulski – proceeding to application, next time as formal review
- 1909 Hosmer - Margot Innes - Minor amendment application - extensions to patios and retaining walls; Neighbours will be notified by the City.
- 1488 Laurier – letter from applicant , Kingsley Lo, requesting a third enquiry was read to the panel but it will be a review after application.

1. Review of Minutes of December 9, 2004 and January 13, 2005

- Minutes of Dec. 9th 2004 were reviewed, and the following changes were made.
- Page 1, Robert Miranda was not present.
- Dr. Roburn requested that his specific wording regarding 1098 Wolfe Ave. should be added to the discussion, as follows: “Regardless of the fact that both the proposed house and landscaping are well designed, it is perhaps not fair to encourage the applicant, as the proposal is not appropriate for FSD.”
- Page 2 the address of the house at Hosmer and Cypress was 1909 Hosmer.
- Motion to approve with noted changes: Moved: Beth Noble, seconded: Carole Walker-Angus, carried unanimously.
- Minutes of Jan 13th were reviewed and approved as presented. Moved: Stewart McIntosh; seconded: Richard Keate, Carried unanimously.

Issue of **Board of variance notification** to FSAD Panel. No formal method can be established. Board of Variance applications are challenges to decisions by Planning, not the Panel. Dr. Roburn and Sailen Black are willing to continue to make the FSAD Panel aware of applications when they are aware of them. Panel members may attend Board of Variance meetings as a resident of FSD (not representing the FSAD Panel).

Attendance at meetings: Planning noted that in fairness to the applicants, FSAD Panel members should be prompt, and should commit to staying to the end of the meeting. This is not only for the purposes of achieving a quorum, but because the intent of the process is to provide the applicant with multiple points of view from professionals and residents alike.

Recording Secretary position: There will not be money budgeted to pay for a secretary to take FSAD Panel minutes. Planning asked the Panel members to find another volunteer to fill the position.

Ray Spaxman report: There have been no further developments to report.

4. Address: 1690 Matthews Avenue

Applicant: Roger Bayley and Ben Wienstein, Merrick Architecture; Donor's representative: Tim Holley

Description: Canuck Place - 'A' Heritage Designation: Redevelopment of the care facility building; addition of a new annex building, and creation of an underground parking garage.

NOTE: Drawings are block diagrams - not representative of the orientation or actual shape of the future building.

Enquiry: First

Preamble:

Very loose scheme (programming diagram). What is shown on plan is a rough representation of amount of space. Substantial issues have yet to be resolved (property lines, ownership of property), FSR relaxation, but the Planning representative wanted to hear from the FSAD Panel at the earliest opportunity.

Proposal:

Hospice is currently licensed for 11 children, but operates below capacity because it lacks services like nursing, schooling etc. More space is needed for family space in order to provide respite services. The hospice aspires to provide a higher level of privacy for children and their families. The facility is suffering from an inability to use the bed count that exists, inadequate space for families, and inadequate space for volunteer services (300 volunteers in hospice). Current program is seeking to increase privacy and number of beds, while considering how existing facilities could be augmented by additions elsewhere on site. Memorial garden property was bought separately (subdivided at time of gift to city) and donated to the foundation. The ownership of the main house remains with the City. The Foundation is looking to amalgamate the two properties. The City currently leases the main property to the Foundation. The Foundation is seeking to redevelop both properties as a single entity, with family housing, volunteer activities and schooling being moved out of heritage house to the proposed annex. If properties are consolidated, the total available FSR would amount to 8,500 sq ft. Proposal is to add underground parking to site with an annex building above. Parking concerns expressed by neighbours would be addressed. Traffic could be brought in through centre of site to alleviate impact on immediate neighbours.

“Option C”: Driveway would proceed through the westernmost gate, towards location of existing porte-cochere on west façade of house, where it would drop underground to parking for 30 cars (to be constructed under the memorial garden). Heritage Porte-cochere would have to be removed and replaced with a new bridge between the two buildings. The underground facilities would also include an area for supplies for the kitchen. Patients would enter the building through the underground lot, and access buildings through an elevator. Access across to main house would be across new link (where porte-cochere presently exists). Annex would be designed as a carriage house type, upper floors pulled back etc., relating strongly to main house. Parking would extend beyond the footprint of the building (parking would, in fact, cover whole lot) with 4 or 5 feet of planting extending above. Parking access would be in back yard setback.

Panel Questions:

- Where in option C does ramp go - completely underground? At front of existing porte-cochere.
- Annex serves a lot of functions, what would the framing of the annex be? Concrete
- How well does existing building work? Character and setting are a huge asset to function, but from a practical standpoint the building is performing below its licensed limit of 11 beds, there is a 1 year waiting list, people are being turned away for respite care. Currently, admin/professional staff in rental spaces off-site because of overcrowding. It would be extremely costly to create a new facility elsewhere (80% of funding is private donation). This reflects 20 year master plan view.

Location:

Proximity to Children's hospital is key; neighbourhood atmosphere is a bonus. Who owns garden? Confusion on that point. There don't seem to be any Covenants on use in relation to donation of garden. Garden is under ownership of Foundation, main house is under ownership of City. Parking restrictions were promised when original plan was brought to City, and haven't been realized. Seems that size of facility is doubling – if current street parking is 30 cars, is the parking requirement not going to double as well? No, increased facility size will mean more staff efficiencies – this will not see a doubling of cars. (16000 sq. ft., 8500 ft. addition. 11 beds currently, brought up to 16.) Why do 5 beds warrant 50% increase in floor space? Could this not be a multi-centred facility? Not enough funding for staffing of existing facility, let alone satellite sites. 16000 sq. ft. original house is what in relation to lot FSR.? 0.45 FSR or very close. Maximum FSR on garden as stand alone property? 6000 sq. ft. Consolidation of two properties allows more sq. footage? Yes, roughly an additional 2,000 sq. ft. Is this an outright use? Yes, Special Needs Residential Facility. Neighbourhood will be impacted in perpetuity. Is Canuck Place going to be there in perpetuity? Management

problems in 1998 were dealt with; Canuck Place has never had funding issues that would threaten closure. Staff? Currently 92 staff full-time equivalent. (7 off site)

Planning Question:

There are unresolved issues outside the scope of tonight's discussion that may or may not prevent the project from going forward. If we can assume for the moment it were to proceed, what constructive comments or areas for improvement are there in the design?

Panel Comments:

Biggest concern is parking situation. Parking has to be underground – option c is best proposal. Impact on immediate neighbours is least with this option. Concerned about parking and neighbours. Project presents an architectural challenge in terms of how the new structure will relate to house. Concerned about streetscape. As a stand-alone building, Glen Brae is one of the best in First Shaughnessy District. Connection to another building would ruin it. Extension won't fit in with main building, will change massing and proportions. More than just ruining a lovely house – this is putting another high-use facility in the middle of a residential neighbourhood. Not the right place, not necessary, bringing more people and cars into neighbourhood isn't going to work. Scale of existing facility fits in to neighbourhood, but just. Already pushing the envelope. Wholeheartedly in support of hospice movement, but job of FSADP is to look out for neighbourhood. Don't screw up what you already have. Take administration somewhere else. Spend money to develop more facilities elsewhere. Buy another house in FSD (either for preservation or redevelopment). Presently, Canuck Place is a wonderful use for the building, but this shouldn't be compromised by an annex that will destroy house and enrage the neighbours. Litigation from adjoining neighbours in previous case will happen again. Lack of complaints about current parking situation is a moot point - Who would complain about parking at a hospice for sick children? Consolidation of properties was promised not to happen when donations for the garden portion were being sought. 92 staff shouldn't be in a single family zoning. Annex doesn't in any way add to the character of neighbourhood. Encroachment of parking lot on setback is a problem. Underground parking and the nullification of habitable FSR above is meant to accommodate residential use, not a parkade. This sounds like the Chinese Consulate all over again. This should be taken to the board of SHPOA, where a hostile reception is to be anticipated. If expansion is in the long-term plan, other sites closer to Children's should be considered. Immediate neighbours feel that trust has already be violated. New annex has to be subsidiary, has to be set back further. 35 feet in height is too much. Driveway is an unattractive recurring problem in FSD – steep tunnel driveway isn't desirable. Loss of garden space is regrettable, having a concrete bunker under the garden is extremely undesirable. Connections between house and garden are important for this use, and should be carefully considered in new proposal. As presented, this project doesn't work at any level. Will be a struggle to convince neighbours.

4. **Address:** 1098 Wolfe Ave.
Architect: Clinton Cuddington
Landscape Architect: Elizabeth Watts
Enquiry: Second

Changes to Architecture:

90'X200' lot. Concept remains as presented at last enquiry. Intention is to retain historic rock wall, and pick up on materiality (which links to adjacent sites and whole block). Singular ordering system for house is a rock wall that reflects this. A study of materials in the neighbourhood was undertaken, and choices reflect this. Primary strength of FSD is in its history of good design. This proposal continues this tradition but in a contemporary manner. Since last meeting, connection between parking area and rest of the house has been addressed. Other modifications have further enhanced concept of contemporary building in historic neighbourhood. This project proposes to knit together these two systems.

Changes to Landscape: Clarified landscape concept since last meeting. More rigour to concept. Strong man made geometry with axes converging and diverging. Landscape zone needs to bridge to softer organic perimeter. Planting that is proximal to house is architectonic. Stepped down front garden. Glimpses of house through driveway and pedestrian opening. Garden is more terraced around driveway to reduce sense of looking up a tunnel. Landscape is more organic at back. Forecourt experience is more attractive for users and passers by. Sculpting of site hasn't changed much. Side yard has changed to facilitate movement from front to back.

Panel questions: Materials and placement? Split faced granite wall runs through middle of house. Roof supports will be of dark stained glu-lam beam with dark wood soffits. Yellow cedar siding (lacquered blonde) and natural (concrete coloured) stucco (not acrylic).

Roof form? Not a pitched roof. Focus on materiality to create a dominant effect. Hovers over form, extends out over house. Relationship is as much about soffit as about pitched form. Game of creating a knife edge with zinc material. Roof will provide space for and "extensive green roof" treatment. Planting mix on roof will grow native sedums, grasses. Advantages of this is in its aesthetics for overview, its ability to absorb rainwater, cooling effect on city, gives back oxygen. Roof cover of houses contributes more run off than all commercial buildings put together. Requires some establishment maintenance (pulling seedlings - access provided for this function) Drought resistant plants.

Planning comments: Planning is interested in hearing the panel's views on the amount and nature of excavation for access to house. Leave aside issue of style, Planning asks the panel to comment on perception of main building mass and form as seen from street level.

Panel comments: Wolfe is not typical of streets in FSD, right on edge, and on an arterial street. Battlements on edge of neighbourhood. Huge hedges, lots of wall. Hard to see an existing architectural heritage. This is an insertion into an embankment that is not typical to the rest of Shaughnessy. Sits by itself. Green roof is good, and neighbours won't have reason to complain about it. Entrance relates to scale of surroundings. Only needs fine tuning. This proposal works for this site. Great design will be a complement to street. No problem with notion of contemporary building on this site. Has to be better than good, needs more work to push it over the line. Roof could be even more dramatic. Access/driveway is too brutal; could be softened by shifting both entrances over. Great improvement in landscape. Integration between interior wall and exterior walls. Preserving wall is good, but concerned about scar left by moving openings. ODP specifically calls out sitelines of houses on Osler/Angus spine have to be protected, and this proposal respects that. Pitched roofs are not mentioned specifically in guidelines, but the roof needs to be a prominent design feature. Support design, new development in FSD shouldn't be a time warp replica. Driveway has to work, first and foremost. Like green roof and landscape. Fully support it. Like rectilinear driveway and relationship to

house. Would be nice to see a better access to house from driveway for kids (mudroom function). Would be nice to see it if it were obscured by larger planting.

Think highly of project, but cannot support it in this neighbourhood. Not appropriate in FSD, but would look great in West Van.

The FSAD Panel is impressed by enthusiasm of design team. Support for this project to proceed to a formal application with comments addressed: 6 for,; 3 against. (Michael Roburn asked to be noted as being against).

6. Address: 1398 The Crescent
 Architect: Keith Jakobsen
 Landscape Architect: Donna Chomichuk
 Enquiry: Second

Changes to architecture: Renovation/addition to existing house. Heritage B Dutch colonial. Understated, beautiful house on 39000 sq foot lot. A large appendage would cheapen heritage quality of original house, so addition is designed as free-standing guesthouse. Free-standing conservatory for plant collection. Distance between Neighbouring house, "The Hollies" and proposed guesthouse is 120 ft. Green area of garden is adjacent to neighbour on Angus. Garage is underneath terrace and guesthouse (Sunken 4-5 ft). Hollies is 19.1 ft taller than guesthouse (2 storeys). Neighbouring house on Angus is 12-3 feet higher than guesthouse. Guesthouse is 6 ft. lower than main house, but is still two storeys (ODP states that any house in FSD should be at least 2). Conservatory is attached to the guesthouse at basement level through a hallway and garage.

Changes to Landscape Architecture: FSD is traditionally made up of English style gardens and English planting, but also some exotics. Owner is a plant collector and wants a mini arboretum (The crescent itself is one). Front yard is pastoral, classic Shaughnessy. Tropical garden moved to back (palm trees etc.). Small plunging pool inside conservatory for tropical plant collection. Grotto feature outside conservatory. Sanctuary garden - quiet, contemplative, a lot of white plants, scented plants towards west of house. Woodland pond with waterfall for white noise (to reduce noise from Granville). Existing concrete wall at front will be addressed by finishing with a parged wall finish (Greencroft, Hycroft, Grey Gables) instead of stone cladding. As fence is hidden by hedge, it would be nice to spend budget on other landscape features. Pizza oven addition can be masked with landscaping (photo circulated showing mature tree that has been brought in).

Panel Questions:

Will guesthouse be visible from Angus? Not likely. 7-8 foot drop in grade. Guesthouse is set in back corner, furthest from Angus.

Shed dormer on guesthouse? Reflects dormer on main house

Guesthouse materials? Painted sidewall shingles. Rock dash stucco, wood trim. As on main house.

Conservatory? Columns, flat roof edge details in wood. Glass. Roof will be of white metal frame with glass panels.

Pitch of roof on guesthouse same as main? Yes, identical

If guesthouse was on same plain as main house would they be the same height? Guest house is 6 feet lower, but 7 feet grade change? Main house at back is 36 feet. Guest house is 29 feet high

Garage door detailing? Not yet drawn, but will be sensitive to house.

Was addition to kitchen permitted? Bubble Skylight and likely the octagonal addition that it sits on was added in 70's. Permits were taken to change the bubble skylight to a glass pyramid. Pizza oven was not permitted.

Planning Comments: Looking for panel comments on stucco or parging finish of front wall and on the scale of the guesthouse, particularly the height.

Panel Comments: The panel wishes to commend applicants for assembling a good team to handle this sensitively. Fantastic design both architecturally and in terms of landscape. Siting is good. Buildings sit better than last time. Character is complementary. Like elements of the project.

Landscaping is outstanding. Going in right direction. Response to concern about palms is a good solution. Nice to see so much landscape, and attention to garden space. More lawn in back would be nice. Water feature in front of porte-cochere might be too close, and panel needs to see detail. Parging on fence looks like a good solution. Parging is fine, although upkeep is needed.

Like to see visual link between main house and guesthouse. Like to see it refined, particularly terraces and their connection to other areas. More fluidity is needed. Stuff between guesthouse and residence is problematic. Natural edge on terrace rather than geometric form would be better. In plan, if garages under guest house could be on different plane, with terraces recessed back for articulation it might help. Grades need to be fine-tuned. Terraces could flow better. Hard angles don't relate to bays on house or soft lines of garden.

Amount of driveway could be reduced if garage with excess width could be at end. Driveway is a huge expanse. There needs to be a terminus to the vista created by driveway.

Nice to see size of driveway diminished. Elevation of garage and doors is needed.

Despite recent planting, pizza oven addition is still bothersome. Corner of house should be restored to what it was originally. Octagon shape seems like recent addition - landscaping has never been accepted as a solution to bad design. Carbuncle on side of what will be a beautiful house. Still don't like Pizza oven addition. Takes away from main house.

Conservatory needs to be rethought. Generally metal in FSD is dark green or black. Banding on conservatory is too heavy. Fenestration on conservatory is a problem - doesn't have to be dutch, but should be more historical. Conservatory doesn't work with house. Nice conservatory, good siting, but needs refinement. Pediment on conservatory doesn't fit well. Needs to be refined, lightened up, more sympathetic.

Scale of guest house to main house - very similar to NW corner of Matthews and Pine (Hamber house). Dormers should be continuous with pitch of top slope of roof. Guesthouse height is good. Would be nice to see a massing model with formal application. Any way to pull down height of ridgeline on guesthouse would be worth consideration.

Great design. Good project.

Meeting adjourned at _____.

- 2. **Address:**
 - Architect
 - Description:
 - Review: