



I S A A C - R E N T O N   A R C H I T E C T   I N C .

206-2780 Granville St., Vancouver, BC V6H 3J3   604 682-1344   604 688-7136 fax   Toll Free: 1 800 377-6994  
rir@telus.net   www.isaacrenton.com

June 15 2017

Lisa Berg, Senior Community Planner,  
District of West Vancouver,  
750-17 Street,  
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

**Re:   Inglewood Care Centre, 725 Inglewood Avenue  
RESUBMISSION TO DRC**

Dear Ms. Berg:

We appreciate the opportunity to make this Resubmission to the West Vancouver Design Review Committee (DRC), to address the DRC Resolutions that were discussed with staff on May 16.

We propose to address the points that are outlined in the DRC Resolutions with the following written explanations, which are illustrated by the attached Appendices. We will further explain our proposals at the June 15 DRC meeting, with reference to the original design booklets, which were previously submitted to the Panel.

**Resolution 1: Conducting a master plan of the site**

The long-term goal of the owners is to upgrade the existing care facility following the rules and design standards set out by the Vancouver Coastal Health Authority. One of these rules is that there must be as little disruption and dislocation as possible to existing residents. The only way this can be achieved at this location is to build the proposed state-of-the-art Phase One facility on the only remaining open area at the south end of the existing building. Once constructed, the existing residents will be decanted into the new facility while their portion of the existing facility is upgraded or reconstructed.

When the Phase One addition is completed, the intent is to rebuild the Manor portion of the existing care facility to better serve the residents. We would decant the Manor residents into the new-build, remove the Manor building, and replace it with Phase Two, a larger care facility that would provide additional amenities and additional underground parking to benefit the whole site. The exact profile would be negotiated through the normal approvals process at that time.  
*See Appendix 1.*

It is not possible at this point to speculate what a Phase Three might look like, because the main determinants, such as standards, needs, and land availability, cannot be anticipated that far into the future.

As discussed recently, we are pleased to provide the DRC with a summary of our collaborative design process that has resulted in our present proposed development profile. In all

design iterations, we were careful to leave open all possible future expansion opportunities, at all floor levels, including the underground parking level. Because the vehicular access issues were a major factor to progressively shape our development profile, we have included additional illustrative sketches and plans. *See Appendices 1.1 to 1.3.*

In the end, there were two competing concepts to access the underground parking:

A. The profile that we preferred took access off Inglewood Avenue, with no left turn out, and with a traffic circle at the intersection of Inglewood and Burley to provide a U-turn opportunity, as well as providing traffic calming to all other traffic at this critical intersection. *See Appendix 1.4.*

B. The option that the DWV staff favoured, and approved, took access off Burley Avenue, with the loss of about 50 mature Douglas Fir trees, the loss of considerable outdoor recreation area and walking loop, and which required that an additional residential property be added to our site profile. *See Appendix 1.5.*

### **Resolution 2A: More Residential Character**

We have made the service level look more residential by adding planter boxes, introducing bay windows to break up the massing, differentiating the floors with separate colours, and adding a canopy and roof over the Galleria and service entrances.

We have broken up the massing of the south façade, to appear as two separate ‘buildings’. To enhance this visual effect, we have used the same residential design cues in different ways on the ‘East and West Buildings’. *See Appendix 2, 3, and 4.*

### **Resolution 2B: Form more suited to spaces within**

Generally the exterior features reflect the character of the interior spaces, such as the dormers and bay windows that reflect the resident rooms inside, and the decks and full height glass that reflect the amenity spaces inside. We have added a new entry canopy to complement the secondary Galleria entry, and we have added a residential scale canopy over the service entrances. The gables are used to highlight major massing forms, to enhance the ‘two-building’ massing.

We have added two new prominent balconies at the east end of the building to reflect the lounge uses, and to reflect the similar balconies at the west end of the building. We have added a new dormer at the top floor at the gap between the two ‘buildings’ to highlight the lounge use. *See Appendix 2 and 3.*

### **Resolution 2C: Hierarchy of building use and private spaces**

The hierarchy of building use, for residents, is a very important principle in the design of care facilities. Our interior layouts conform to the VCH and Ministry of Health Design Guidelines. The most public areas begin at the main entry, together with the associated open

amenity spaces such a café and public lounge, for everyone's use. Next is the access 'street' leading to the semi-private spaces that include a staff work station and service functions that typically serve resident areas. Each resident area is designed as much as possible to be completely self-sufficient, each with its own lounge, dining, and activity spaces, and utility spaces, so that the residents can remain private from the others. Within each resident area are the private resident rooms, which are the most private spaces of all. This internal hierarchy of building use and private spaces is reflected on the exterior with appropriate residential features as described in 2B above. *See Appendix 2, 3, and 4.*

### **Resolution 3: Relocate service areas**

The location of service areas, and possible relocation, was of particular concern to DVW staff, because of perceived impacts on the neighbourhood. Accordingly various options were reviewed in detail with DWV staff early in our collaborative process, and, after reviewing all possible alternatives, no other location was found to be feasible. *See Appendix 2, 3, and 4.*

The service areas in the existing care facility are at the south end of the building. The proposed new addition attaches to the existing building at the service end, and, accordingly, additional new service areas will be added at this location. The new addition is separated from the existing building by a firewall, which separates the existing and new structures into two separate 'buildings' for the purposes of the BC Building Code. We cannot move or make any substantive changes to the service spaces in the existing building without triggering a requirement to upgrade the whole existing building to present Code standards, which is not feasible.

### **Resolution 4: Further consideration of the loading area and location**

Since the service areas cannot be moved, as outlined in 3 above, the present profile remains the only viable option. This issue was also of concern to DVW staff, and, after reviewing all possible alternatives early in our collaborative process, the present profile was approved by all DVW Departments.

In our opinion, the proposed new loading area is a significant improvement over the present loading situation: we have reduced three driveways to two; we have removed the existing surface parking and open, unscreened loading area; the service trucks no longer need to manoeuvre in the Inglewood Avenue roadway; and, our loading bay is screened from view from the neighbourhood by grade change and hedges. *See Appendix 2, 3, and 4.*

## **5. Opportunity for preservation of mature trees on Inglewood Avenue:**

We have consulted with our landscape architect Pat Campbell and arborist Mike Mills and report the following summary of tree conditions along Inglewood Avenue: *See Appendix 5.*

A. Trees 618-621 are a row of Sawara Cypress, which are considered to have low landscape

I S A A C - R E N T O N   A R C H I T E C T   I N C .

206-2780 Granville St., Vancouver, BC V6H 3J3   604 682-1344   604 688-7136 fax   Toll Free: 1 800 377-6994  
rir@telus.net   www.isaacrenton.com

value, they have grown together, such that no individual trees can be saved.

B.     Tree 478 is a Big Leaf Maple, with good form, and is an off-site tree, to be saved or removed at the City's discretion.

C.     Tree 438 must be removed because of the new driveway location and Tree 439 cannot be saved, because it has grown together with 438.

D.     Trees 1310-1315, at the SW corner of the property, are unattractive, and would diminish the size of the secure patio for the Special Care Unit, cast shadows, and litter it with needles.

E.     In summary, the only trees that could be readily retained are Trees 244, 488, and 489, at the southeast corner of the property *See Appendix 5*.

We respectfully suggest that we have adequately addressed each of the Resolutions and we look forward to presenting our response to the DRC on June 15.

Yours truly,  
ISAAC-RENTON ARCHITECT INC.



Robert Isaac-Renton

Cc     Nick Whittle, Inglewood Care Centre  
       Gary Vlieg, CTS

Appendix 1: Preliminary Conceptual Phasing Proposal  
              1.1. + 1.2. + 1.3. + 1.4. + 1.5.

Appendix 2: Southeast View

Appendix 3: South View

Appendix 4: Southwest View

Appendix 5: Existing Trees along Inglewood Avenue