



City of Vancouver  
Community Services Group  
Current Planning

## First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

Minutes of the Meeting of October 13, 2005

<b>Present:</b>	Robert Miranda, Chair	Resident Member at Large
	Beth Noble, Vice-Chair	Resident - SHPOA Member
	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
	Michelle McMaster	BCSLA
	Derek Neale	AIBC
	Steve Palmier	AIBC

<b>Regrets/Absences:</b>	Stewart McIntosh	BCSLA
	Richard Keate	Heritage Commission Representative
	Judy Ross	Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver

**Recorder:** Katherine Reichert

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

### AGENDA

- 1. Business:**
  - Review of the Minutes of September 22, 2005
  - Discussion of Members Status on FSAD Panel
- 2. Address: 3638 Osler Avenue**
  - 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
  - Review:** First: DE409706

## 1. Business

### Approval of Minutes:

- Minutes of September 22, 2005 (unavailable).
- The minutes of August 11, 2005 were approved as presented. Moved by Kilby Gibson and Seconded by Carol Walker-Angus.

### FSAD Panel Membership Status:

- Member status on the Panel was reviewed. The City Clerk will send members their membership status with the procedure to reapply and the renewal date.
- There was concern expressed by Panel members that the landscape plans are not being received before the meetings to review. Members should ask this question of the applicants.

### Project Updates:

- **3898 Angus Drive:** New landscape plan showing new driveway location. Does it need to be presented again to the Panel, or can the Director of Planning process it? All agreed to let the Director of Planning make the decision.
- **1389 The Crescent:** The plan consists of no exterior change to the front of the house or added square footage. Only change is to the rear of the house, changing some of the existing windows to doors and adding a stepped terrace. The Panel agreed to let the Director of Planning process the plan but emphasize that the windows/doors should be in keeping with the existing styles of the house.
- **1402 McRae Avenue:** Enquiry in beginning stages regarding zoning.

2. Address: **3638 Osler Avenue**  
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.  
Review: First: DE409706

**Program:**

Landscape Architect, Masa Ito, discussed the difficulty in added green space because of the outlay of the driveway that requires a turn around area. Plan will retain all the front character trees and retaining wall. Proposed central water feature in the front yard. Main garden will be located in the north east section of the property with grass, plants, and a gazebo with an arbour for climbing roses. Drawings were given to the Panel members of the gazebo, water feature beside the garage, and the sunken garden in the back of the house.

**Panel Questions:**

Which room in the back of the house will overlook the back water feature? Dining room.

- Is the north east side garden too shaded by the house? South side has tall trees that shade the south side of the yard and the shade studies show the north east side was better for the sun.
- What material is used for the driveway? Permeable concrete paver stones.
- How far is the house east of the property located to the current proposed addition? Have not looked because with the density of vegetation and the trees on the neighbouring property, you cannot see the neighbour's house.
- What is the garden path made of? Crushed rock
- What is the width of the grass area between the north side of the house and the garden path? 33 feet.
- Is the house addition to the maximum allowable height? The maximum allowable is 35 ft. and the roof is at 33 ft.
- What are the ceiling heights in the basement and main floor? They will still be to the existing 8 feet.
- Is the Port Cochere paved underneath? Yes, underneath to the back wall of the house.
- Is acrylic stucco a new material? It is a material that gives added water-proofing making it stay cleaner and more durable.
- Any thought of using wooden shakes? No, the plan is to stay with the original materials used on the house.

**Planning Comments:**

- Excellent goal to retain and applicant has taken through all required reviews. Planning is happy with the siting of the addition. Need to have more detailed landscape plans provided. Some concern that the roof ridge on the addition is at the same height as the existing main house. Would like to see the wall at the back of the port cochere have more open character and visual interest in keeping with the rest of the house.

**Panel Comments:**

- Happy to see retention of the building following the guidelines of the Heritage Commission. Like the landscaping. Addition needs to have a more simplified roof design. Dormers on Osler Street could be raised. Could add another window to the back of the port cochere. The elevation of the east gable is not proportionate to the rest of the house. The north gable's elevation does not match the others. The gables have two different patterns of boards from each other. The roof plan of the addition is very complex compared to the main house. Driveway appears massive. Is there any way to increase the permeable area? Happy to see the front expression of the house removed. Any way to make the driveway more formal to respond to the rest of the formal landscape? Hope that the gazebo does not seem like a modern structure but one in keeping with the heritage character of the property. Door off of the den on the first floor is art nouveau style and out of character in keeping with the other door styles. Apparently it already existed. Windows in the den overlooking the staircase are plain and inconsistent with the other window detail of the house. Removing the upstairs and downstairs 7 ft. by 9 ft. section would help the look of the house. Addition is busy looking. The addition needs a

small dormer on the front in order for it to look like the rest of the house and not as an addition. Amount of green lawn is nice. Possibly soften the driveway with a boxwood hedge along the perimeter. Like that the trees were all retained with only one removed. Bedroom windows in the basement are small and consequently the rooms will be dark. The skylights to the rear seem out of character. The addition needs to carry on the character of the original house.

**Response:**

- **Motion:** The Panel supports the application with the Panel's comments addressed.
- **Moved:** by Beth Noble; Seconded by Barbara Campney.  
**Carried** unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 pm.