

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

Minutes from the Meeting of May 31, 2010, 4:00 pm

Location: Committee Room # 2 at Vancouver City Hall.

Present:

Lori Kozub, Chair	Resident - SHPOA Member
David Cuan, Vice-Chair	Resident - SHPOA Member
Erika Gardner	Resident - SHPOA Member
Victor Piller	Resident - SHPOA Member
Lu Tang	AIBC
Loy Leyland	AIBC
Michelle McMaster	BCSLA
Judith Hansen	Heritage Commission Representative
Lisa MacIntosh	Real Estate Board Representative

Regrets:

Mamie Angus	Resident Member at Large
Phil Yacht	Resident Member at Large
Wilfred Ng	Resident Member at Large
Paul Sangha	BCSLA

City Staff:

Ann McLean	Development Planner, UDDPC
Alina Maness	Landscape Development Specialist

Recording Sec.: David Cuan Resident - SHPOA Member

Agenda

Business:

1. Review of the Minutes of May 6th, 2010
2. Recent Projects Updates
3. ODP Discussion

New Business:

1. Address: **1300 W 15th Avenue**
Inquirer: Formwerks Architecture/Viewpoint
Description: Multiple conversion dwelling and infill dwelling-
Landscape Revision Only
Status: DE Application (DE413690)
Review: Second (First on April 15, 2010)
2. Address: **1550 Angus Drive**
Inquirer: Stuart Howard Architects Inc.
Description: Addition and Alterations to a pre-1940's house-
Landscape Revision Only
Status: DE Application (DE413688)
Review: Second (First on May 6, 2010)

Business, 4:10-4:30pm:

1. Review of May 6th, 2010 Minutes:
 - No comments or corrections.Motion to pass; Seconded

Comments on April 15th, 2010 Minutes:

- Correction to “Agenda” summary in Minutes: 1300 West 15th Avenue reviewed as First “Application” rather than “Enquiry”.

2. Recent Projects Update:

- 1 enquiry for a new house.
- 1518 Laurier Street:

There were a number of enquiries relating to the fire-damaged home. As the fire damage to the existing home is under 60% and there was no significant structural damage, it is unlikely that a demolition order will be granted.

- 3638 Osler Street:

A number of mature trees at the front of the site were taken down and removed. City to confirm that a permit was taken out for this and advise if mature replacement trees are proposed. Photos of the felled trees were circulated.

3. ODP Discussion:

- A letter from the Vancouver Heritage Commission signed by Richard Keate requesting a review of the FSODP was forwarded to Council with a copy to Councillor Chow.
- Some members prefer to have a partial review of the document to tighten some clauses and sections and bring them in line with the goals and intent of the bylaw.
- The size of parking and double-height areas not counted in the FSR calculation resulting in big bulky homes are concerns.
- To consider imposing a maximum FSR for a home, regardless of the site size it is on.
- Design guidelines vs. prescriptive bylaw?
- Is “bonusing” an option?
- Chair will solicit more opinions before preparing a letter from FSADP to Council.

New Business, 4:30 pm-6:00 pm:

1. **Address: 1300 W 15th Avenue**

Presented by Formwerks Architecture and Viewpoint Landscape Design

- The windows in the upper bedroom of western unit of the main house redesigned to minimize privacy concerns between this room and the coach house.
- The existing grouping of 3 conifers/2 deciduous trees located north of the site and along the re-aligned entry driveway to be removed.
- Pedestrian pathways accessing the main house and infill from the entry driveway are redesigned to be meandering with a seating area along one of them.
- Roman pavers are used for the pathways and the vehicular turnaround located west of the main house.
- The landing of the access stair to the west unit in the main house widened for a better transition to the paved vehicular turnaround.
- Layers of plantings on both sides of the access driveway provide a pleasant buffer between the site and the adjacent street.
- There is a proposed 8’ high cedar hedge with a 6’ high fence on the western side of the site, to be located on the neighbour’s property. Smaller trees and other vegetation are specified on the project side of the property line.

- As the pathway moves towards the southern portion of the site, the existing grades are modified to effect a smooth transition between the path and surrounding landscaping.
- The proposed visitor parking located on the west is pushed northward and afforded additional landscape screening from the neighbour.
- Hedges and more planting are proposed to screen the patios and lawns of the eastern units from each other and from the adjacent common pathway. Size of the patios are enlarged and the lawns reduced.
- The two parking stalls located on the east is moved further away from the coach house to allow more planting buffer.

Questions:

- How does the city enforce that landscaping is built as per the approved plans? In most cases, full landscaping must be in place before occupancy permit is granted. When the weather delays full implementation of the landscape work, the city holds on to the required landscape deposit until work is completed soon after weather permits. Nevertheless, the proposal must include 1-year landscape maintenance to encourage the installation to flourish.
- Is an only vehicular access to the proposed coach house from the lane permitted by FSD ODP? Past infill projects have direct vehicular access from the streets flanking the properties.
- Why is the address 1300 instead of 1320? Address changed by owner.

Planning Comments to Panel:

The Panel asked the applicant to address the following concerns relating to the proposal at the first review:

- Site circulation
- Privacy between patios and infill
- Front yard treatment
- Access driveway

Have the concerns been adequately addressed?

Comments:

- The front of the main house still looks like a townhouse project with 3 distinct entries.
- Would like to see more effort to preserve existing trees along the proposed entry driveway.
- Front pedestrian pathways need to be more significant.
- The access driveway could be narrower to allow a wider pedestrian pathway along it.
- Front lawn and surrounding landscaping are a bit rigid.
- The location of front lawn in the shady north end of the site will be difficult to maintain.
- Should consider the use of conifers in the landscape screening between the main house and the infill coach house.
- The landscape buffer between the infill coach house and the lane too sparse.
- The proposed landscaping plan makes informal contacts between the residents difficult.
- Access from the western unit to the paved pedestrian walkway leading to the garbage/recycling area is awkward.

Summary:

The panel is pleased with the revised landscaping plan and the additional privacy screening afforded to the proposed 4 dwelling units on the site. We would like see more of the existing trees retained adjacent to the proposed access driveway, if possible. We also suggest a design modification to the main house to minimize the current look of an obvious townhouse development where the 3 main doors/access stairs are located on the front façade.

Motion:

To support the project with comments addressed. Seconded; One opposed.

2. Address: **1550 Angus Drive**

Presented by Stuart Howard Architects Inc. and Ron Rule Consultants Ltd

- The parking garage is relocated further away from the east property line to improve vehicular access/egress.
- The proposed porte-cochere is now attached to the north side of the relocated garage.
- Water feature in the back lawn removed.
- An arborist report was submitted. The document indicated that there are 2 high risk and 10 marginal trees on the site that merits their removal. These will be replaced with 28 new specimens.
- A pedestrian entry is provided besides the vehicular gate at the front of the property.
- The front lawn is located higher than the flanking access driveway.
- A paving stone patio now separates the back lawn from the gravel driveway to its east. This keeps the straight-edge of the lawn.
- The existing maple tree besides the existing home is now relocated westward, close to the west property line.

Questions:

- Is there going to be a gated fence between the back of the house and the garage? Yes.
- What is the age and size of the replacement trees? Mature trees of approximately 15' high.
- Some of the trees noted in the arborist report do not show up in the landscape plan. There was a coordination gap as the report was only available a few days before this presentation.
- Do existing trees that are classed as "marginal" in the arborist report need to be all replaced? The term "marginal" may not necessarily mean that these specimens cannot be relocated or rehabilitated. The present proposal noted that all 10 are to be removed and replaced. Could the designers reconsider?
- Are some of the existing mature shrubs such as the large lilac bush going to be retained? Will try to do so.
- 2 existing holly trees and an existing linden tree are retained.
- There is no over-all scheme that relates to the proposed rigid boxwood "par terres" at the front of the home. Why the proposal? The desire to provide a contrast between the informal front lawn and the formal garden as a visual interest.
- Is the basement to be excavated for the planned renovation of the existing home? Yes.
- Could the proposed porte-cochere be attached to the back of the house instead? City to advice of this possibility.
- Is there going to be protection around the window-well to the basement at the back of the house? Yes. There will be a 42" high railing.

- Could the garage doors be re-aligned to achieve a better turning radius for vehicular access/egress?

Planning Comments to Panel:

The Panel asked to see revisions to the landscape proposal submitted at the last review, specifically a more detailed landscape plan and an arborist report. The Director of Planning seeks your advice if the current presentation addressed your previous comments.

Comments:

- Garage location still not satisfactory. The current location looks cramped.
- The pedestrian access from the street to the house is underemphasized in the current landscape plan. There is no dedicated pathway from the street.
- The landscape plan is not clear on what existing vegetation is to remain and what is proposed for removal.
- Consider the use of another paver; the proposed type is a bit downscale for the project.
- The formal vs. informal landscaping throughout the site is disconcerting.
- The window-well for the basement should be protected as this is located along the traffic path between the backyard patio and the garage.
- Consider relocating the porte-cochere to the back of the house and over the back entry.
- Consider relocating the entry gate for the driveway into the site to allow for more planting at the front property line.

Summary:

The panel feels that the presented landscape plan lacks clear information on which existing trees are to be retained/relocated/removed. Also, there is a concern that more existing trees are proposed for removal than necessary. Some panel members pointed out that the design rationales for the landscape design are not consistent and perhaps may not be appropriate in some cases. For example, the use of a downscale paving stone, the proposed location/scale of the pedestrian gate, and the unresolved dichotomy of the formal boxwood par terres with the informal front and formal back lawns are not ideal. The cramped location of the parking garage at the back of the property with a porte-cochere that does not function as such is unfortunate.

Motion:

To see the DE for the third time with an updated landscape plan and comments addressed. Seconded; All in favour.

**Meeting adjourned at 6:00 pm.
Next Meeting: June 17, 2010**