

## FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** March 9, 2017  
**TIME:** 4:00 pm  
**PLACE:** Town Hall Meeting Room, Vancouver City Hall

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS OF THE FIRST SHAUGHNESSY DESIGN PANEL:

David Cuan	Chair, Resident, SHPOA
Mollie Massie	Vancouver Heritage Commission
Frank Shorrock	Resident, SHPOA
Joanne Giesbrecht	REBGV
Donna Chomichuk	BCSLA
John Madden	Resident
Kathy Reichert	Resident
Mamie Angus	Resident
Pamela Lennox	Resident, SHPOA
Nichole Clement	Resident, SHPOA
Tim Ankenmen	AIBC
Michael Leckie	AIBC
Lu Xu	BCSLA
Robert Miranda	Vice chair, Resident

**CITY STAFF**

Susan Chang	Development Planner
Ji-Taek Park	Development Planner

**LIAISONS:**

Catherine Evans	Park Board Commissioner
Melissa de Genova	City Councillor

**REGRETS:** George Affleck      City Councillor

**RECORDING**

**SECRETARY:** Camilla Lade

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- |    |                           |
|----|---------------------------|
| 1. | 1037 West King Edward Ave |
| 2. | 1341 Matthews Ave         |
| 3. | 1093 Wolfe Ave            |
| 4. | 1695 Pine Crescent        |

## Business Meeting

Chair Cuan called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm and noted the presence of a quorum.

### Business:

- Development permit process

### Project Updates:

1326 Laurier Ave	Heritage character and value assessment submitted in January. The evaluation as well as staff assessment was received by the SoS and Heritage Register Subcommittee of the Vancouver Heritage Commission on March 6, 2017
1664 Cedar Crescent	New application for 3 car garage

### Review of Minutes:

February 16, 2017 – Passed with amendments.

---

### **The Panel considered four applications for presentation**

---

Address:	1037 West King Edward Ave
Description:	Rezoning to Development Permit
Review:	Third
Architect:	Shape Architecture
Delegation:	Nick Sully, Ben Fisher and Jen Stamp

---

### **Planning Comments:**

The site is an approximately 95' by 200' foot lot located on the north side of West King Edward just west of the Oak Street intersection and is non-protected property. The site is flanked by a mixed-use 4 storey C-2 development to the east and a non-protected single family 1 storey First Shaughnessy development to the west.

In June 2016, site was rezoned to CD-1 (comprehensive development) District, to increase the floor space ratio from .45 to 1.48 FSR to permit the development of a four storey residential building, containing 36 secured rental dwelling units.

*Policy context: Interim Rezoning Policy for increasing Affordable Housing Choices, Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaugnessy (ARKS) community Vision, First Shaughnessy District ODP.*

Urban Design Conditions include the following:

- Increase front yard, west side yard setback.
- Reduce massing adjacent to the eastern neighbour by setting back fourth storey.
- Reduce massing in the rear yard by relocating service uses and bike storage.
- Increase the connectivity to the social space.
- Habitable rooms to meet horizontal angle of daylight regulations.
- Improve livability of the third floor studio units.
- Improve unit privacy within the development.
- Alleviate potential privacy impacts on eastern neighbours.
- Provisions of high-quality, durable exterior finish materials.

#### Landscape Conditions

- Landscape treatment to maintain substantial (layered) greenery as a planted buffer around property edges.
- Provide a varied mix of trees and shrubs, facing King Edward Ave. to create a cohesive green finish to the street.
- Provide high quality, livable and secure common outdoor open spaces.
- Provide fully landscaped setbacks adjacent to lane edges.
- Final coordination of the overall landscape treatment to meet the intent of First Shaughnessy Heritage Design guidelines.
- Provide maximized plant growing medium volumes for trees, and shrubs within landscaped planter area.
- Provide a flexible Child's Play space.

#### Questions to Panel:

1. Does the revised proposal sufficiently address both Urban Design and Landscape Conditions as outlined in the CD-1 District?

#### Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The applicant's approach was to provide two main circulation cores in the middle of the floor plate and to do away with the typical internal double loaded condition. This allows the inside of the site to open to three central courtyards. We've also introduced a secondary series of townhouse typology units on the south and west sides of the property. The courtyard design is intended to link together and create a network of spaces that are connected and more permeable. The stairs were removed internal to the courtyard, opened up the courtyard width, more light to the interior spaces, created more pathways to connect the spaces, as well as more amenity spaces. There is a children's amenity space and amenity room in the design. The setbacks along the adjacent property and West King Edward were pushed back.

The rezoning conditions ensured a robust and quality material pallet. The three faces are proposed in quality masonry. On the east side, the upper unit materials proposed are stucco. There is timber on the soffits and screen design. Window frames and flashing are aluminum.

#### Landscape:

The west property line has existing conifers and new shade trees to buffer views from single family homes to the west. Along King Edward there is an increased 6 foot patio and an 8 foot landscape buffer. It allows for more layering, filtering, screening, filigree and skewed views in. There is a row of small trees inside the property line and Yew hedges as additional layering planting.

#### Panel Commentary:

The proposal is striking but reads institutional. Facades could be softened, and would encourage a more friendly residential character. The colour palette could be less stark. Location may be appropriate near an arterial for this type of project. However, others disagreed. Some members felt the massing transitioned well to single family while others felt it failed. Animated lane frontage was appreciated. Larger windows for bedrooms would improve livability by allowing more light into the rooms. Also more glazing could soften the building facades. CPTED concerns expressed at courtyards. Panel members were divided on palette of materials, and some members expressed concerns regarding maintenance of white masonry.

The front yard setback should be increased and have more robust evergreen planting. At the southwest corner (project entry), a mature canopy tree could be provided. There is limited planting space in some areas and planting with seasonal interest could be added. One panel member would have preferred taller buildings to achieve more gardens and setbacks. Consider roughing in for wrought iron gates off the alley in case they become necessary for security.

**Chair Summary:**

Although located at the southeast corner of First Shaughnessy District boundaries, developments along these areas should comply with the requirements of the present HCA zoning. Ideally, this project should not be in First Shaughnessy as it serves as a contentious precedent. However, viewing through a CD-1 lens, it is a well thought out project and an improvement on its previous iterations. The overall massing, activated lanes, palette of materials are successful. Nevertheless, the façade is too institutional looking and could be softened to First Shaughnessy character. Larger glazing should be introduced. Fencing should be wrought iron. There are differing views on transitioning of massing.

Front yard setback is not robust enough and there should be more evergreen plantings as well as trees planted at the perimeter. A large tree can be planted on the southwest corner to mark the entry and help reduce transitional scale. There should be integrated seasonal planting.

**Applicant's Response:**

The applicant thanked the panel for assessing the project through CD-1 lens. The window comments were appreciated, and an increase in glazing to soften the proposal will be considered. Overall, the comments were thoughtful, although the setbacks are difficult to address because it is a rental property. The materials were challenging quality wise because it is a rental with building cost considerations.

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7 in favor, 3 abstentions, 3 against)**


---

Address:	1341 Matthews Ave
Description:	Scott Posno Design
Review:	First
Architect:	Scott Posno Design
Delegation:	Darcy Hanna and Stephen Dee

---

**Planning Comments:**

This is a proposal for a new dwelling on an approximately 101' by 137' lot with no lane access on the north side of Matthews near Hudson Street. Parking is accessed from the existing crossing. The design is described as traditional historical style and materials include cedar shingle roof, stucco and Tudor board combined with cedar shingles and stone masonry base.

**Questions to Panel:**

Can the panel comment on the success of the architectural and landscape design proposals as they relate to the First Shaughnessy Guidelines?

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The intention was to enhance the existing fabric of the Shaughnessy neighbourhood. The applicant is referencing English Arts and Crafts style. The design is meant to enhance the horizontality of the house with three distinct layers: the main floor, the second floor and the roof. All the materials used are from the heritage design guidelines. The base would use real masonry; the house will be elevated off the street. Painted cedar shingle cladding is planned for the main floor. And cedar shingles are planned for the roof, which is designed as broad and steeply pitched. The massing is broken up with dormers on the front and rear elevations. The existing driveway is brought to the rear with a two car garage at the back in order to break up the massing of the house.

**Landscape:**

Landscape was dictated by the existing features, retaining the driveway and existing mature trees. The owner asked for open grass areas in the front. Evergreens are planned for the front with curved walkways. The front wall would be granite stone matching the house. The gate material design is in

wrought iron. The driveway would be pavers with a wide joint and natural flagstone curving pathway.

**Panel Commentary:**

The heritage guidelines and neighbourhood was well taken into consideration. It is one of the nicest new buildings with great proportions in massing and front façade composition. The stepping roof line to break down the massing is preferred to one ridge line. The cedar shake roof is appreciated. The detailing of windows are consistent throughout the building. One panel member noted the windows from dining room is too two-dimensional. It could be a bay window to give it three dimensions and shadow. Furthermore, the dormer at the top does not have the same detail as the rest of the house. The quality of the covered outdoor space is fantastic but skylight above could be further designed.

Retaining existing mature trees especially the Dogwood is appreciated. The landscape adds to the pastoral look of First Shaughnessy, although filigree and layered planting should be increased in the front and against the house. The pathway in the front is too straight and symmetrical. More variety and height of shrubs is needed in the front yard.

**Chair Summary:**

The panel looks favourably on the proposed project. It is very modest in the way it sits on the site. The design of house and garage meets the first Shaughnessy guidelines. The stepped roofline breaks up the mass and makes it quite special. The presentation of a colour and material board is appreciated. The applicant should consider having the skylight on the roof deck surrounded by benches to make it less obtrusive. The closet space in the attic could use some lighting through a dormer or a skylight. The landscaping needs more layering and filigree both at the property line and against the house. The pastoral look of the resulting landscape will be most attractive.

**Applicant's Response:**

The dormer detailing would help improve the project. The applicant agreed layering and filigree is desired, but the owners wanted more grass. More depth of planting is a good suggestion.

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (13 in favor, 0 abstentions, 0 against)**

---

Address:	1093 Wolfe Ave
Description:	New Build - non-protected property
Review:	First
Architect:	Sarah Gallop Design Inc.
Delegation:	Sarah Gallop and Stirling McLeod

---

**Planning Comments:**

This is a proposal for a new dwelling on an approximately 90' by 125' lot, no lane, with a significant slope of 16' drop from the front to the rear property line. The proposal is a two storey building referencing English Arts and Crafts style. Materials noted are Duroid shingle roof, Hardi shingle cladding and stone base.

**Questions to Panel:**

Can the panel comment on Architectural expression and materiality, relative to the First Shaughnessy Guidelines in addition to general comments?

**Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The applicant wanted to reference existing styles in the neighbourhood with a very traditional look and take advantage of the slope of the lot for views. There is a large deck on the back to take advantage of the views and the overall roof form. It is a symmetrical house at the front. The design would have a base stone around the building, similar to the existing architecture in the area.

**Landscape:**

No landscape present.

**Panel Commentary:**

The tri-partite structure is working. However, the rear elevation, especially the deck and the large stacked volume, does a disservice to the rest of the design. Window placement seems random, and lacking in hierarchy. There should be more windows on the side elevations. The rear stone base is too overpowering. It should be broken down, by taking the stone pillars and widening them and bringing them down to the ground. The dormers on the front façade are not well proportioned and make the house look top-heavy. The front entrance lacks presence and the front door is too small. The materials such as Duroid shingles and Hardi-siding are problematic especially given the prominence of the roof (note that Hardi-sidings are not allowed under the First Shaughnessy Design Guidelines). The gate and fencing should be wrought iron. The back door and deck are too small and do not relate well with the rear garden. The design is not capturing First Shaughnessy.

The front yard garden is a French style and not pastoral. There should be more layered and varied plantings. The design lacks back yard patio space. The indoor/outdoor relationship is marginalized. The house should be set in a garden and should be integrated with the garden. Concrete driveway is not supported as a high quality material.

**Chair Summary:**

The front elevation is more successful than the rear. The dormer size and arrangement seems to overpower the roof. The divided lights of the windows are not well thought out; there is no hierarchy of window design between the first and 2<sup>nd</sup> stories. More window openings should be located at the sides of the building. The stone base underneath the columns that support the front porch is overpowering. There was a concern about the indoor / outdoor relationship between house and landscape. The doors are too small or not expansive enough. A paired French doors located at the back veranda will help. Some of the proposed materials do not comply with the district's design guidelines.

The landscaping should have more layering and filigree. It is unfortunate that the landscape architect is not in attendance as half of the presentation to the panel should be devoted to landscape design.

**Applicant's Response:**

The comments on materials were taken into consideration and appreciated. The applicant would like to decrease the amount of stone, but there have been pressures from other avenues. The guidelines have limited the design. The site is a difficult site.

**EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (0 in favor, 1 abstentions, 12 against)**


---

Address:	1695 Pine Crescent
Description:	Conservation Proposal
Review:	First
Architect:	Loy Leyland Architect. Inc.
Delegation:	Loy Leyland and Julie Hicks

---

**Planning Comments:**

This conservation application proposes additions to an existing 1923 home, noted as a variation of the English Arts & Crafts style. Character defining elements identified include:

- low sprawling form in asymmetrical elevations with multiple hip roofs and dormers. Original building had 3 tall brick chimneys that offset the low form and were prominently visible above the roofline.

- Exterior Walls: multi-textured cladding combining brick, wood cladding and stucco.
- Windows: casement windows with diamond-patterned leaded transoms, and double hung windows. The original wood front door.
- The prominent porte cochere.
- Interior features: built in cabinetry, millwork, wainscoting, coved ceiling several fireplaces and an art-glass feature.

Two major additions at the rear (south and east elevations) have obscured elements of the original design.

The site is fronting 3 streets (Cedar Crescent, Pine Street, and entry located at Pine Crescent). Lot is an irregular configuration to an approximate 125' by 135' size, with a significant slope with an approximate 16' foot drop from south to north property line.

#### **Questions to Panel:**

1. Is the addition visually compatible with, subordinate to, yet distinguishable from the existing building?
2. Commentary on proposed exterior form as viewed from Pine Street.
3. Commentary on proposed approximately 2' high trim component resulting from increased 18' main storey ceiling height.

#### **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

It is a tricky site with depressed areas. The overall footprint is the same. Many facades are retained and replacing a rear addition. The floor space is under the allowed. The applicant is restricted in where the additions can be located. Materials are original brick, with help of heritage conservation specialists. Adding to the existing 9' ceiling height is important because it allows more up to date spaces and with new concrete flooring and restructuring, would be too low as existing upper storey has low ceilings. Overall height is around 36' which is less than for a new house. The front is low facing the street. The glass leaded windows and openings are intended to be retained. There is a cedar roof which will be matched in new additions. The garage is close to the neighbour, but the applicant tried not to move the building.

#### **Landscape:**

The two existing crossings will be retained but re-oriented to protect an existing tree. The driveway will be clad with unit pavers. Existing retaining wall at the perimeter of the site will be clad with granite. There is an existing hedge that is too tall for the house. This is proposed to be replaced with layered planting. The wall at the bottom of the site is in poor condition and structural tie backs are recommended outside of the tree protection zones. A new pedestrian connection to Cedar Street is proposed. The west side grades are respected in the design proposal. A new low wall, yew hedge, heavy stone clad posts with wrought iron gates enclose the west and north edges of the garden.

#### **Panel Commentary:**

House has been severely altered, so this application may be a reasonable compromise from a sustainability viewpoint. From a heritage viewpoint, at what point are you altering the house so much that it loses its heritage value and is not worth retaining, such as the exterior alterations required to raise the ceiling height on the first floor. The pronounced octagonal bay window and roof shape are a character-defining element, made more prominent by the freestanding garage. A few panel members thought the front facade should be restored to its original intent, with more references back to the original design. Others thought the house had been altered so much it could not be reverted back to the original and made liveable. Rehabilitation or restoration is the issue.

When restoring a house, one should first go back to the original house drawings and photos, rather than try to improve on later alterations. Is there a way to recapture more of the original character of the house in this renovation? House is charming, but could retain heritage facade and heritage defining elements and make it livable today. One member suggested that referencing the original could result in a chaotic, comfortable and adorable house.

Several members opposed changing the front facade of the heritage house by adding a taller crown moulding to the soffit trim to fill gap required for increasing first floor ceiling height. This could be

mitigated by filling in the gap with something vertical like a soldier course of brick, or dimensioned vertical trim. Another option would be to raise the house 18". This would be supportable because the house is located in a swallow, and sits low to the ground on the Pine Crescent side. This could also make the house more prominent on Pine Crescent.

The low rambling roof forms are another character defining element. Adding the garage addition as shown on the plans, would also change the front facade of the original house. Is there a way to make the garage and second storey addition less of a monolithic design feature? The proposed garage looks suburban and not First Shaughnessy. It was recommended that the garage be moved further north so as not to detract from the octagonal bay and roof form on the front facade. Garage door could mimic the original custom door. Could lights be added to the garage door? The leaded glass windows should be retained. Proposal is commendable and will be expensive, but wherever possible try to conform to the original house.

The deck detracts from original 45 degrees configuration and original relationship to the landscape. It was suggested that the architect go back to the original drawings and photographs to see how they addressed this significant secondary entrance, rather than trying to improve on what is there now. The existing deck is not appropriate for a First Shaughnessy house. Having some stairs come off the living room doors to a lower terrace would help transition the grade changes along that side. Rock retaining walls and terraces would respect the natural landscape, and eliminate the need for a long latticework under the deck. This would also allow the basement windows to function as originally designed. Foundation planting would provide a much softer streetscape along Pine Street, while creating more privacy for the owners.

There are good gestures on this project that improves the landscape, such as the driveway and reflective pool. The front gate should be wrought iron. The filigree, layout and design of the landscape is appreciated. The development application should have landscape feature details such as wall fountain and reflective pond details.

#### **Chair Summary:**

Based on the panel's extensive comments it appears that more work needs to be done to bring the proposed alterations closer to the spirit of the original design of the house rather than just addressing its present condition.

Panel members support raising the ceiling of the first floor but there is concern that the proposed crown moulding covering the increased band of wall resulting from this work changes the character of the house. Another concern is that the proposed addition to connect the main house with the existing free-standing garage compromises the original octagonal bay window. And that this linkage as proposed creates a monolithic roof that lacks the charm of the existing varied rooflines.

The panel commends the retention of art glass and the re-use of cedar shingles.

The panels feels that the building façade facing Pine Street should not have a new flat deck in the manner of the existing one and with latticework underneath, even if it is obscured from the street with a tall hedge. And to pay homage to the original design of this façade showing a secondary entrance with the adjacent terraced grounds, some panel members suggest that a patio could be developed as a landscape element. Further design development is required for the proposed reflecting pool.

The proposed landscape design is well-received.

#### **Applicant's Response:**

The applicant thanked the panel for their comments.

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT (11 in favor, 0 abstentions, 1 against)**