



CITY OF VANCOUVER

COMMUNITY SERVICES
Planning Department
Current Planning

NO QUORUM

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

Minutes of the Meeting of April 28, 2005

Present:	Beth Noble (Vice-Chair) Maureen Molaro Michael Roburn Barbara Campney Michelle McMaster Derek Neale Steve Palmier	Resident - SHPOA Member Resident – SHPOA member Resident - SHPOA Member Resident – Member at Large BCSLA AIBC AIBC
Vacant		Resident – Member at Large Resident - Member at Large
Regrets/Absences:	Robert Miranda (Chair) Carole Walker Angus Stewart McIntosh Judy Ross Richard Keate	Resident - Member at Large Resident -SHOPA Member BCSLA Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver Heritage Commission Representative
Recording Secretary:	Margot Keate West	

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

Agenda

1. **Business** Review of Minutes of April 7, 2005
2. **Recent Projects Update**
3. **Address: 1375 West King Edward**
Applicant: Loy Leyland
Description: Proposal to address WWOP: A new 3 car garage; minor changes to the house; removal of a shed skylight and structural connections to the garage; existing rear stairs have been adapted; and a shed dormer added at the rear of the house
Enquiry: First
4. **Address: 1398 The Crescent**
Applicant: Keith Jakobsen, Jakobsen Associates
Description: 'B' Heritage Designation: Proposed new guest house, garage, swimming pool, nanny's quarters, conservatory and pizza oven in rear, and new landscaping in front yard. Some work already in progress.

Application: First Review

5. **Address:** 1275 Tecumseh Avenue - Oblate Community Residence
Applicant: Scott Romses, Romses Architects Inc.
Description: Demolition of the post-1940s dwelling, construction of a two-storey Oblate Community residence with 10 units seniors supportive and assisted housing, and with 6 underground parking stalls and 1 to 2 surface stalls at drop off area.
Enquiry: First

1. **Business:**

- **Minutes of April 7th, 2005** were reviewed and the following change was made: Beth Noble was present. Minutes were not approved as there was no quorum.
- **FSAD Panel Vacancies:** Planning reported that there is no new information regarding the FSAD Panel vacancies.
- **Attendance at Meetings:** The FSAD Panel asked that the City Clerk's office pursue a commitment to attend from members who have missed many meetings. Poor attendance impacts on the FSAD Panel's ability to achieve a quorum, and cannot be tolerated on a regular basis.
- **Addition to Agendas:** The FSAD Panel requested that the dates of previous reviews be added to the agenda where applications/enquiries have been seen before for the particular addresses.
- **Tree Removal:** The FSAD Panel expressed concern about the removal of trees in the 3400 Blk. Pine Street. Planning advised that removal inquiries should be addressed to the city.

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

- **3898 Angus Drive:** John Hollifield renovation. Minor alterations not requiring trip to FSAD Panel. Commentary will be sought from immediate neighbours.
- **3890 Alexandra Street:** Stefan Wiedemann will be pursuing an HRA for this property.
- **1498 Laurier Avenue:** After going to the BOV, requirement was overturned but owners will go with stone rather than stamped concrete anyway.
- **1397 Matthews Avenue:** New design has been brought in and will return for review.
-

3. Address: 1375 West King Edward

Applicant: Loy Leyland/Loy Leyland Architect Inc.

Description: Proposal to address WWOP: A new 3 car garage; minor changes to the house; removal of a shed skylight and structural connections to the garage; existing rear stairs have been adapted; and a shed dormer added at the rear of the house

Enquiry: First

Program:

Georgian house set at back of lot with pool in front yard. Work was done without permit and was stopped. The architect has been retained to satisfy the city's needs. The existing house has had a dormer added at back, but overlaps rear yard setback as does back of house. Non-conforming garage was built without permit. Neighbours are concerned about the proposed replacement garage structure. Engineering has agreed to a 1 ft. setback from lane, and proposed garage would be 18 ft. deep (shallow but workable). Kitchen bump-out will be re-roofed. There are no impermeable surface issues. Zoning is concerned about proximity of garage to back of house, but there doesn't appear to be another solution. Owner wanted a flat roof on garage with deck on top but applicant has been persuaded by the City to have a pitched roof. Siting of garage is where an outright garage would be if the house were sited within current setbacks.

Panel Questions:

- Lane width? 20 ft.
- Garage is accessory building? Yes. Has to have a gap between it and main house to qualify as such.
- Proposed addition? Existing dormer
- Skylights over kitchen? Bulk of them are existing and will be removed, glass block will be removed. One skylight will be retained over kitchen.
- Asking for relaxations? Not really - zoning has changed to make existing house non-conforming. Application here is a courtesy. Panel is being asked to approve dormer addition to the back. Planning is concerned about walkway between kitchen and garage but this is needed for stairs to access kitchen from back yard/garage.
- Why is existing walkway raised? To gain access to garage from kitchen. This situation already exists and the work was done with a permit.
- Garage access? Double door access from lane and porte cochere (drive through).

Planning Comments:

Proposed scheme fixes a number of existing on-site problems. Continue to be concerned about proposed raised deck/walkway that connects garage and kitchen. Planning would like to see this at grade so that garage reads as separate accessory building. Dormer is in the style of rest of house and hasn't been the source of neighbourhood concern.

Panel Comments:

Dormer is okay, in keeping with house. Dormer is fine. Skylight that exists is even okay. Not concerned about linkage between house and garage considering site conditions. 3 and 12 pitches aren't great. 4.5 would be better on garage. Kitchen view will be terrible. If pitch could increase overlook view will be better. Staircase railing could be detailed in wood to match other wooden railings. It would help to make it a part of the house. Diveway doesn't look useful. Improvement over what was built before. Not a happy situation but can't be helped given siting. 2 car garage would appear less bulky, but doesn't address problem which is depth. Don't want to see owners modify roof to make a deck of it. Deck could be built towards the west if owner wants that. Raised walkway could be well-used by placing planters on it to obscure view of garage.

The FSAD Panel wishes to congratulate the architect on attempting to sort this out.

Support for proposed application with comments addressed. All in favour.

LATE ADDITION TO AGENDA:

Address: 3638 Osler Avenue Letter sent by Applicant to Chair
Applicant: Kingsley Lo, Kingsley K. Lo Architect Inc.
Description: Addition to the back and north side; relocation of garage to the southeast; renovation and landscape alteration for this "B" Heritage house - Enquiry of siting of the renovation & addition.
Enquiry: Second

After last enquiry, this proposal was taken to Vancouver Heritage Commission (VHC) for approval in concept. Option 6 was chosen. The architect would like the FSAD Panel's opinion on this siting plan before making an application.

Panel Questions:

- Exactly same drawing as the HC saw? Yes, the VHC comments are attached.
- Driveway cuts? The VHC supported site planning but wanted existing driveway cut, with no other cut added. This serves to retain heritage river-rock perimeter wall.

Planning Comments:

Planning supports VHC position. Location, site-plan, driveway opinions expressed by the VHC were noted and are attached to the proposal presented here.

Panel Comments:

Concern for redundancy of porte cochere in this plan, but siting is the best option available. Driveway surface could be reduced with appropriate choice of materials. Support for concept, and for comments made by Vancouver Heritage Commission, including retention of existing driveway cuts.

The FSAD Panel wishes to indicate support for the direction of this project. All in favour.

- 4. Address: 1275 Tecumseh Avenue - Oblate Community Residence**
 Owner's Representative: Father Bernard McCosham
 Nursing: Annette Garm
 Applicant: Scott Romses, Romses Architects Inc.
 Landscape Architect: Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates
 Description: Demolition of the post-1940s dwelling, construction of a two-storey Oblate Community residence with 10 units seniors supportive and assisted housing, and with 6 underground parking stalls and 1 to 2 surface stalls at drop off area.
 Enquiry: First

Proposal:

The Oblate community has owned 1311 The Crescent since 1968. The house next door was purchased at 1275 Tecumseh. Tecumseh house currently houses 6 members on Tecumseh, 3 on The Crescent. Present Tecumseh residence isn't suitable. It was built for a family with 8 children. Plumbing is inadequate and rooms are small. Would like a new building for continued use as a retirement home for members of the Oblate Missionary Order. Assisted living facility with 9 residential units. Some are small 1 bedroom sleeping units with sitting area. All units have a small kitchenette (bar fridge, etc.), gas fireplace, and outdoor space. Conflict between ODP and City's assisted living guidelines. This affects allowable storage for each unit, and the City has said that ODP rules, so storage has been moved to garage.

Trying to keep estate-like character of FSD and intention of FSD ODP and Guidelines while satisfying program.

Existing mature trees will all be retained, even on lane side.

No relaxations are being sought. 9000 sq ft (allowable FSR max.) and setbacks conforming. All units designed around handicapped accessibility. H shaped plan. Common areas at heart of house (library and dining) with wings for residences. Creates a lot of semi-private and private outdoor spaces. Embraces site. Oriented towards views (NE). Covered porch off of Tecumseh adds layers. Parking comes off of lane, with 6 car garage underground. Exercise room, hobbies and other amenities in basement as well.

Design strives to be neighbourly but wants to be of the moment, not a pastiche of pre-date FSD styles. Authenticity of materials and ones that relate to neighbourhood are proposed. A-symmetrical massing speaks to neighbourhood styles. Robust masonry base and perimeter wall. Tripartite expression with steeply pitched roof. Wood siding, stone base and chimney. Craft and detailing will be robust.

Landscape:

Existing significant street trees (36" diam elms) will be retained. At back, trees are mostly cherries and lane has some mature trees as well. One poorly pruned tree on lane may need to be removed. Layered landscaping. Granite wall with entry piers at driveway. Circular driveway with 12 ft. opening at each end. Pedestrian access at south driveway entry. Lay-by for handicapped parking (handi-dart use). Permeable pavers. Smaller trees behind, hedging at fence. Existing house and property is fairly open to street. Foundation planting with small trees, shrubs and groundcovers is proposed to provide filigree views of new building. Chapel looks onto a formal courtyard with water feature. Vegetable gardens on west side. Storm water retention will be handled with a dry-pond in NE corner.

Panel Questions:

- Kitchen/ food preparation? Live out cook - nine residents eat together.
- Link to other house? Current thinking is that residents of The Crescent will move to Tecumseh. The Crescent house may at some point be sold, so property lines are being defined as is.
- Handicapped accessibility? Both interior and outside elements take this into account. Fully handicapped accessible
- Sleeping unit vs. 1 bedroom? 1 bedroom is like a suite with sitting area, sleeping units do not have a sitting area. Difference in units is to accommodate FSR restrictions.
- Elevator? Yes, by front door.
- Nursing unit? Not live-in but facilities for occasional use. Nurses that stay over night won't be sleeping.
- Parking? Many priests don't have cars but parking will be available to those who do, as well as help/nursing and communal van.
- Enough parking for service providers? Shouldn't require much more than other large homes in the area.
- Materials? Roof - cedar shakes, wood siding, stone in areas (some siding, base and chimneys).

- Location of entrance to underground parking ? Lane is wider at that point. Trying to keep access as far away from Tecumseh as possible and keep lane trees where possible.

Planning Comments:

No major concerns. Interested in FSAD Panel's opinion on fit with neighbourhood

Panel Comments:

Not a whole lot of interaction between interior and soft landscape areas. Basement patio could relate more to what's happening at main garden level. The paved path should go through flower garden area for handicapped accessibility. Front façade - outdoor porch isn't yet a comfortable fit. Stepped back porches and balconies are very pleasant. Great improvement over what's there. Great presentation (both printed and powerpoint). Contemporary feel of CAD drawings is refreshing. Pursue this further. Back driveway would be nice if it were green (plants spilling over retaining wall, etc.) Support concept, well presented, well sited. A-symmetry is good approach and will work well. Front façade is craftsman in feel, with south façade being much more contemporary. Chimneys are spindly, try to avoid flat roofs. Design is headed in right direction. 1311 The Crescent would be greatly improved by being painted. Front and back look like two totally different houses. Back facades are too modern. Can't feel institutional, has to be residential.

Proceed with FSAD Panel comments addressed.

5. **Address: 1398 The Crescent**

Applicant: Keith Jakobsen, Jakobsen Associates

Landscape Architect: Donna Chomichuk

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

Application: First Review

Changes to Architecture:

Conservatory which was attached to guest house has been pulled away. Now treated as an accessory building, 20 by 48 feet. Connection between guest house and main house was tenuous. Parking plan has changed with area that jogs back between guest and main. Although the two buildings are attached, they read as separate structures from the driveway. Pizza oven will be integrated with outdoor fireplace. Pattern of modules in driveway have been introduced in order to break up appearance of expanse of hard surface.

Changes to Landscape:

Terrace shape has been changed. Geometry allows better flow of stairs. Rounded out strange geometry of centre of lot. Side terrace now relates to main house, not guesthouse. Landscape introduced between two building as a hinge. Japanese maples are being moved to top of terrace for shade. Centre of lot - geometry form will change from presented - lagoon rather than pond shown will work better. Comments are needed. Driveway length has been broken up with patterning and planting. Garden shed at end of driveway provides focal point.

Panel Questions:

- Water feature depths? Front pod 18 in. to 3-4 ft., conservatory will be for plunge swimming and will be deeper. Tropical area will be shallow, water fountain in front will be shallow.
- Lighting of conservatory and effect on neighbour? No proposed lighting in conservatory - daylight only. Tree canopy will overhang conservatory and neighbouring building is an indoor swimming pool building without windows on this side.
- Distance between conservatory and guest house? 10.5 feet
- Colour of greenhouse? Dark green metal
- Garden shed? Used for garden tools and dog house at back.
- Breakfast nook? Glass skylight and octagonal form added 1970. Existing non-conforming but permitted at the time.

Planning Comments:

Happy with approach. Concerned about better detailing on conservatory. Proposal to keep glass skylight over kitchen eating area is a problem.

Landscape permit will be issued for front yard so that work can begin soon. Stone columns are being added along length of front retaining wall.

Panel Comments:

Congratulate applicants on improvements from first inquiry. Huge difference: applicants addressed most comments very successfully. If main terrace area could be dropped 3 steps it would improve views out from house, but proposal is fine as well. Great improvement. Feels adult- oriented, but very well done. Outdoor spaces look very usable. Pond extension/conservatory could be altered as shown and it would be fine. Great presentation. Think about moving conservatory away from guest house by a few feet.

FSAD Panel wishes to provide a show of support for this project. All in favour

Note to Planning : This project may proceed with no need to return to the FSAD Panel.

Meeting adjourned at 6:05 pm.