

## FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

**DATE:** April 12, 2018  
**TIME:** 4:00 pm  
**PLACE:** Town Hall Meeting Room, Vancouver City Hall

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

Kathy Reichert	Resident (Chair)
Erika Gardner	Resident, SHPOA
Pamela Lennox	Resident, SHPOA
John Madden	Resident (Vice Chair)
Diane Kunic-Grandjean	REBGV
Mollie Massie	Vancouver Heritage Commission
Nicole Clement	Resident, SHPOA
Lu Xu	BCSLA
Richard Sirola	Resident, SHPOA
Frank Bailly	Resident
John Wang	Resident
Sean Blackwell	AIBC
Clinton Cuddington	AIBC
Dean Gregory	BCSLA

**CITY STAFF**

Susan Chang	Development Planner
Gavin Schaefer	Development Planner

**LIAISONS:**

**REGRETS:** Catherine Evans                      Park Board Commissioner

Melissa de Genova                      City Councillor  
George Affleck                              City Councillor

**RECORDING  
SECRETARY:** Kathy Cermeno

### ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- |    |                       |
|----|-----------------------|
| 1. | 1203 Matthews Ave.    |
| 2. | 1102 Wolfe Ave.       |
| 3. | 1677W King Edward Ave |
| 4. | 1625 Matthews Ave     |

**Business:**

- Chair Reichert called the meeting to order at 4pm and noted the presence of quorum.
- Welcoming Sean Blackwell & Clinton Cuddington.
- Senior Heritage Planner position is shared by Helen Cain & Zlatan Jankovic. Helen Cain will be presenting Heritage initiatives on May 24th.
- Soffit lighting discussion.
- Review of Minutes:
- Approval of February 8, 2018 minutes.

**Project Updates:**

1645 W King Edward Ave.: minor amendment to reconfigure a hot tub and add a pool.

3688 Hudson: application received for a new house.

1950 W 18th: application received for a conservation proposal.

---

**The Panel considered four applications for presentation**

---

Address:	1203 Matthews Ave.
Description:	Conservation Proposal
Review:	First
Architect:	Loy Leyland, Loy Leyland Architect Inc.
Delegation:	Loy Leyland, Architect Ron Rule, Landscape Architect,

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations (12 in favour, 1 against)**

---

**Planning Comments:**

This conservation application proposes revisions and additions to an existing Arts and Crafts style house known as *The Sundorne*, built in 1911, is one of the oldest homes in First Shaughnessy.

Character defining elements of the existing house include:

- Prominent hipped-roof structure with paired gabled and front gabled roof dormers. The front dormer was altered in the past.
- Exterior walls exhibit original materials of stone foundations, wooden shingles, stucco and half-timbering details.
- Original window locations with some multi-paned leaded glass.
- The front entry was significantly altered with an addition in the 1950s. A side verandah is intact which was originally a porte-cochere and includes its original, elaborate scroll-cut brackets and tapering granite columns.
- The entrance gate (with *The Sundorne* engraved on the stone pillars) and landscaped driveway.

Based on historical and physical value, it has been assessed as a high-medium evaluation such that interventions to the building should not impact its original form, scale and massing.

The site is an irregular configuration with an approximate 200' frontage that tapers to 64' and has a depth of approximately 340' with no lane access. The house is maintaining its existing location, removing the front entry and restoring the front façade to its original state including the restoration of the front dormer, thus reinstating the original 100' front yard setback. The proposal includes an addition substantially setback at the rear as well as a new foundations. The front entry porch is reinstated facing Matthews and a secondary entry is proposed repurposing the past porte-cochere at the west elevation. This entry with the sleeping porch above is shifted forward to allow a

separation to the new addition. The existing garage is retained and a new 2 car garage proposed as gate house at the front of the property. There are 2 gate houses in the streetscape (neighbouring properties to the west). A teahouse is also proposed at the rear. Materials noted are granite to match existing, brick chimneys, cedar shingles, stucco and half timbering details and asphalt shingles.

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

1. Please comment on compatibility and relationship of the new addition to the existing Arts and Crafts style house.
2. Can the panel comment on the new garage / gate house?
3. Commentary on the success of the landscape proposal as it relates to the FS guidelines?

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

This is an existing house built in 1911, with an addition which is proposed to be removed. There is (is omit) a side porte-cochere, now a patio, proposed to move slightly to allow for additional space. The elevation on the east and a good portion of the north and the entire front will be kept and restored. Originally there was another driveway on site; the design concept is to reuse the gatepost to draw attention to the main house entry. The historic entry will also be restored. In regards to the relocation of the main entry stairs. Planning recommended to be relocated to the west, so they don't compete with the original entry stairs. A gatehouse is being proposed to split up the parking and use the existing parking garage. This is a way to get a functional parking space, and add interest to the house. There is a tea house which will be used as a play area. The massing of the addition includes hip roofs to give back to the original house's primary gable roof form. Half-timbering ties the addition into the original house.

#### **Landscape:**

The property is park-like and has many trees on site, while still providing sunlight. The pedestrian entry will be keeping the umbrella pine to get a view of front door as you enter. There is a pond with a meditation pavilion. There is 275 feet of vista through metal arches and a focus of trees to the end. There are many ways to move around the property lots of cross axial relationship. There is a fountain that hopefully will create some attraction. The main house is at least 100 ft back from the property line. There is quite a garden experience happening prior to arriving to the front door. Entry has a large amounts of rhododendrons presently, with 75 proposed to be moved to the edges. There is a music garden and others that are themed. Additionally there is a spa, outdoor kitchen, children's play area, and a walkway for kids. The majority of the trees will be saved and proposing 47 new trees. There will be a new greenhouse and service area behind the existing garage.

The applicant then took questions from the panel.

#### **Panel Commentary:**

- Generally supports the project. It is a great restoration by maintaining the three sides of the original house and setting the addition back. Review if the window on the east side of the bay can be seen through, and suggest keeping the original front door and windows. Be aware of heavy rains for the back entrance to the basement, as it may flood during a downpour. Use as much of the old granite, but redo grouting in traditional style. Like the idea of keeping the west side porte-cochere. Ensure the wrought iron is in keeping with the traditional/original pattern. Consider filigree views into site.
- Excited to see a renovation project of this caliber, and commend the project. Massing of the building is working well as the main house maintains its prominence. Concerned with how the two buildings are stitching together. Explore fusing the shed roof of the upper porch around the corner to create a consistent brow. In regards to the legacy of the home, it is important to take a step to explore the next generation of authentic materials as asphalt

- roof is not sustainable. In regards to landscaping, the forecourt could benefit from building being pushed forward to deal with fusion issues in regard to new/old building. Gatehouse could benefit from landscape shielding for a more filtered view. Concerned with the fate of the tree upfront.
- Support the design and like relocating rhododendrons and pavilion. Landscape created a good music garden and archway. Concerned about impact to the existing tree by the street. Gatehouse can be softened with low shrubs. West side façade chimneys appear a bit too prominent.
  - Connection between the new house and old house is not clear, as well there could be more connection to the garden. Entry hall has very little light coming in. Looks beautiful and like the project.
  - A more spacious garden will make all the difference, with a focus on views
  - The project is Impressive and beautiful. Support the landscape design as the garden is exquisite. Don't care much for the garage at the back. Suggest keeping the stone work and grouting style, and review the roof materials.
  - Support, magnificent. Highlights are the garden.
  - This is a positive project especially from the street front, and no issues with the form. Like the gatehouse. Concerned with the connection between the old and the new. Understand the challenges.
  - Great garden, but the gatehouse can be softened and mitigated.
  - With large properties the challenge is how to strengthen spaces to be more meaningful. Have counted eight lovely spaces. Would be interested in proposed paving materials. More sinuousness in the driveway without abandoning the arc in the lawn space would be recommended. Hedge along walkway seems unnecessary, and more screening along the driveway.
  - Approve getting rid of the old addition in front of the house. There is a nice balance between old and new. Keeping the classic materials consistent is critical to the integrity of the project. Suggest additional planting to soften the gatehouse as it feel like the building is right in front of the street.
  - Unfortunate applicant was not permitted to move existing house forward. A concern was the dormer as it appears there is only one eye-brow but generally support the project.

### Chair Summary:

There is unanimous support for the project as it successfully incorporates old house with new addition. Concerns raised in regards to space between the old and new. Asphalt roof material is not very environmental, and consider cedar shingle roof. Put more filigree in the front yard. Ensure front tree adjacent to gatehouse is saved. Provide landscaping in front of the gatehouse. Like the landscape design with outdoor rooms and keeping granite with grouting to match existing, original front doors, windows and porte-cochere. Provide quality paving material to strengthen character of areas and wrought iron to match existing.

### Applicant's Response:

The applicant thanked the panel for their comments.

---

Address:	1102 Wolfe Ave
Description:	New Build – non protected property
Review:	First
Architect:	Hollingsworth Architecture Inc
Delegation:	Russell Hollingsworth, Sara Rahman, Hollingsworth Architecture Inc. Ron Rule, Landscape Consultants Frank Xu, Owner

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations (12 in favour, 1 against)**

---

### **Planning Comments:**

This is a proposal for a new dwelling on an approximately 90' x 220' mid-block lot with no lane access along Wolfe Ave. The site has a significant drop of approximately 30' from the rear property line to the front of the property and a screen of existing mature trees in the front yard. Parking is located below grade covered by a roof garden utilizing the grade differences of the site. The proposal is 2 storeys with a basement at 35' overall height. It is a contemporary architectural expression located adjacent to another example of a modern building. Materials include granite stone, brick, architectural concrete and Fir cladding.

Per the guidelines, "Architecture in First Shaughnessy includes a variety of styles and architectural expressions. Contemporary architectural ideas may be considered in a proposal demonstrating a rigorous design process and a high degree of compatibility with other buildings on the site, neighbouring sites and streetscape."

Questions to Panel:

1. Can the panel comment on Architectural expression, relative to the FS Guidelines in addition to general comments?
2. Can the Panel comment on the success of the landscape proposal as it relates to the FS guidelines?

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

The existing building, built in 1949, is on a narrow long linear lot. The whole layout of the building was purposely made to save as much as the trees and vegetation on the street as possible. The rationale was to address the streetscape to bridge the two buildings aesthetically. One is very modern and the other is a classic park expression. Materials chosen to address the two expressions include fir windows, stonework, and brick. Parking was an issue; issues include the required detachment of the garage. The garage was placed in the courtyard area below grade so extra space could be created for the garden. The existing driveway is still in its present form but narrower. There is presently a swimming pool and tennis court, therefore permeable area has been cut in half.

### **Landscape:**

Presently the architecture is hidden by the landscape. There is a large maple tree and elm tree that will be retained and 7 trees that will be added to the front to assist with defining this front space. There is a significant old beautiful hedge that will also be retained. There is a high concrete wall in the back that will be screened. Most of the material, including over the garage, will be evergreen. There will be enough filigree and mass of material to define the spaces. The double entry will be reduced in size.

The applicant then took questions from the panel.

### **Panel Commentary:**

- Like the design and garage treatment if it meets the regulations. The circular driveway seems appropriate on a busy street. Large overhangs and the horizontal design is supported as well as material choice. Should provide additional landscape screening for the neighbours.
- Ensure the green roof has sufficient soil. Suggest meandering driveway and provide filigree.
- Like the garage design, and like how there is a bit of a dip in the driveway. Support the openness of the site. Suggest having a lot of foliage around the house to soften it. Trees and additional filigree is a good idea given the sharp edges.
- Design elements and finishes are nice. There is good connection to the basement/garage.
- Support the project, the green roof, skylights and the underground parking. Approve of all the landscaping in front of the house. There needs to be a connection from parking to

- house and suggest adding a driveway gate to add interest.
- Beautiful house and garden. In terms of the landscape less is more in that the design shows restraint and materials are elegant.  
Like the granite wall behind the pool. Like the constraint of the overall design. Do not support the introduction of large trees over green roof structures, as this may lead to some long-term durability implications. Suggest planting a boulevard would create a nice separation for traffic and pedestrians, and possible readjustment of the driveway.
- Commend the project as style is of the time rather than mimicking the past. Explore a more prominent roof line and base could be more emphasized. The parking situation is a bit concerning. Garage could be pulled in to allow trees planted in the side yard.
- The project is Interesting. Like the style and parking solutions. Don't think you need tripartite expression in a modern building.
- Beautiful project, especially the clerestory. Enjoy how windows opens up to the outside as well like the fragranced landscaping. Feel the project is cautious and respectful of its neighbours and like the U-shape driveway. The garage is brilliant.
- Support the project, a lot of thought has put into a difficult lot. Considerations include access without a ladder to the roof to clean leaves and provide other maintenance, along with a location of where to place the garbage and recycling.
- This is a refreshing proposal. Like the garage underground and that you can walk on the skylights. Support the garage being connected to the main house, and glad to see retention of a circular driveway. The detailing of the roof is nice. A gate is not practical with sloping driveway.

#### **Chair Summary:**

House, garage treatment, green roof, skylight, and materials are supported. Suggest access changes from garage to house. Possibly move the underground garage away from the property line so there is more planting and privacy from the adjacent neighbour. U-shape driveway is good for safety and maneuvering onto a busy street. Shape driveway for additional planting and more filigree. Soften the retaining wall with drooping plants and planting around the house. Pavers could be rectangular to be consistent with house. Roofline and base make it more prominent. Fragrant landscaping is appreciated. Create privacy possible gates, with consideration to safety and access.

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

The applicant thanked the panel for their comments.

---

Address:	1677 _W King Edward Ave
Description:	New Build – non protected property
Review:	First
Design Consultant:	Axes Design & Consulting Inc.
Delegation:	Leo Lin, Yuan Ye, Axes Design Larry Fiddler, Landscape Architect Zhang Weilong, Owner, ZWL

---

**EVALUATION: Non Support (0 in favour, 0 abstentions, 11 against)**

---

#### **Planning Comments:**

The application proposes a new dwelling on an approximately 82' x 200' mid-block lot with a 3 car garage accessed from the lane along West King Edward Avenue. The proposal is a 2 ½ storeys with a basement at height of approximately 41'-6". It is noted as a blending of the historic Craftsman and Tudor Revival styles. Materials include cut stone, brick, stucco and half timbering details.

### Questions to Panel:

1. Can the panel comment on Architectural expression, relative to the FS Guidelines in addition to general comments?
2. Can the Panel comment on the success of the landscape proposal as it relates to the FS guidelines?

### Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The design concept of the building is to be subtle and low key within the neighbourhood context. The site is located on West King Edward. This is on the boundary of the first Shaughnessy area. In order to respect history of the area, façade is composed of a mix of Tudor and craftsman style, the two most common styles in this area. The slope of the roof was increased. Materials used will be limestone, wood, red bricks, and granite.

### Landscape:

This is an old bungalow open to the street with considerable overgrowth. The idea was to enclose it in with the cut granite stone and wrought iron fence spanning in between from entry sequence straight through to the landing area. There are a series of different trees, evergreen and flowering trees, to create a buffer and screening from street to main house. There is standard layering planting scheme to ground covers and front foundation. There is a lawn area with little garden paths meandering to the backyard. Idea is to have the landscape looking good and seasonally colorful all year long.

The applicant then took questions from the panel.

### Panel Commentary:

- Proportionally at the massing level it is working. Height is not compatible with the neighbours and shadows will impact the neighbours. This building should be in alignment with what is expected in this area and one of the two styles should be chosen. There is a fenestration zoo and the windows appear too varied. There is an incredible room count creating a lot of compartmentalization. Could edit styles of windows. Roofing could move away from Duroid product. Aluminum guards should not be used, consider wood.
- Find it a tall, dark, and austere building. Not a fan of the landscaping plan as backyard will be dark. Concerned with mesh of styles. The water feature is inconsistent with the Tudor style and arranged in a way that is not very enjoyable. Suggest realigning the walkway from back door to lane. Paving could be brick or stone in lieu of concrete. The formality and linearity of the project is not consistent with the house and could provide more filtered views.
- This project is not entirely out of character, more details in execution and materiality would be helpful.
- Massing is too high and boxy.
- Good effort. The structure over the entrance looks austere and takes light away from the entry hall.
- The façade has a lot happening, over-patterned, and needs to be simplified. The front gable is too deep and height could be lower. More layered planting and greenery is needed as there is too much pavement.
- There is an uncomfortable blending of the two styles. Design needs to lead one way or the other. The roof style makes for a dark entrance. There is too much hard surface area.
- The mixture of design styles is not working. Steep eaves are too steep. Too many types of windows and windows panes especially in the front and they don't hold together. Consider using vertical windows. Suggest revisiting the front door, sidelights and access from the garage to the house.
- The entire front of the house appears busy. Height seems excessive. Reconsider choice of asphalt roof. The current landscaping is underwhelming.

- Concerned with scale of building in relation to neighbours. Detailing in forms could be refined and simplified. Consider using only one style of window. The landscaping needs to be refined.

### **Chair Summary:**

Concerns were raised with height as it is not compatible and shadows neighbours and backyard. Mixing of two styles, Tudor and Craftsman, needs more work. Windows could be more vertical and coherent. Roofing could avoid asphalt. Entrance is too deep. Front door could be revisited. Landscape needs more filigree in the front. Water feature could be more enjoyable and a focal point. Revisit entry pathways. Railing detail and fencing could be more consistent. Simplify front facade.

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

The applicant thanked the panel for their comments.

---

Address:	1625 Matthews Ave
Description:	New Build – non protected property
Review:	Second
Design Consultant:	Raffaele & Associates
Delegation:	Trevor Toy, Raffaele & Associates Larry Fiddler, Landscape Architect,

---

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations ( 7 in favour, 1 abstentions, 0 against)**

---

### **Planning Comments:**

This is a proposal for a new dwelling on an approximately 70'x225' lot with no lane access. It is a relatively flat site. The 3-car garage is accessed from Matthews. The house is two and a half storeys and 40.8' in height. The application is described as Georgian Revival Style with materials as mainly stucco, and a natural stone base to contribute to the tripartite expression. Windows and soffits are wood, with balustrades used for guardrails.

### **Previous Panel Comments**

- The height should be reduced
- The roof pitch should be modified to assist with height
- The dormers should be modified to be consistent with a Georgian style house
- Details on windows and fascia could be improved
- Proportions of railing and balconies should be further explored
- The base of the house could be less visually prominent
- The railings on porches need to be softened
- More filigree is needed on front yard landscape
- The front walkway could be revised and softened
- The garage could be modified to improve garden area.
- Rear yard planting should be used to soften walls and separations between driveway and patio
- The side stair on the driveway could be improved

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

The height has been reduced 3 and half feet from the overall height. The main floor has been reduced from 12 -11 ft, and the second floor from 12 -9 ft. The dormers have been reduced and the windows adjusted to a proper ratio. The color of the base



has been lightened to limestone or sandstone. The railings have been enhanced to make the entrance a little grander. The garage has been readjusted towards the fence side, to allow for additional space, with grade beams and pilings.

**Landscape:**

The front now has a curved pedestrian walkway to the landing at the base of front stairs with more planting to create more layers and screen off the direct view to front façade of the house. The amount of hard surfaces in the back will be reduced by reconfiguring to have a turn around and create more green space at the back so the residents can turn vehicles in and out of the house and have a much larger lawn space. There is a layer of trees, shrubs and hedges to soften the back. There is a gentle curve to the walkway on the side of the yard. There is a space at the base of the stairs where the recycling and garage will be located.

**Questions to Panel:**

Does the revised proposal sufficiently address the previous panel commentary?

The applicant then took questions from the panel.

**Panel Commentary:**

- Approve of the changes in general.
- Elegant home.
- Good height and elegant design.
- The project has improved. Color scheme lighter. Still find height a little high but a minor concern. Really addressed many of the issues
- Support the final product, massing and color scheme.
- Important items have been addressed, i.e. front door, windows and lights. Only concern is the chimney too tall.
- More details required for the paving. More effort needed to create hedge near structural elements. Understand it's a challenging formal Georgian style house. The selection of plant material addressed the symmetry. Suggest a more elegant transition from formal symmetry to informal planting.
- Generally massing looks good. Minor suggestion a house like this requires careful attention to detail. Not fond of color scheme, and materials could use a little more work.
- It is a challenging narrow site and the way it has been resolved is elegant. Minor suggestion is this house runs at being a bit anaemic if the white is not right with the sandstone base. Not a fan of the shingles chosen and suggest choosing a material more aligned with the vernacular home. Landscaping is too bordered.

**Chair Summary:**

Appreciate effort on a challenging site (narrow). Windows are more in tune with style and details are improved. Colour scheme and base could be darker. Change in roofline and garage location are appreciated. Need details of paving material. Provide more hedges to buffer the driveway. Provide durable materials. Ensure proportion of chimney is not too tall.

**Applicant's Response:**

The applicant thanked the panel for their comments.