ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 1888 Mathews Avenue  (Application - first)

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Collins called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm and noted the presence of a quorum.
Business:
Staffing update:
Welcome new members.

HAPL Update from Marco D’Agostini, Don Luxton and Tanis Knowles Yarnell
Staff update on HAPL Open Houses

Project Updates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3786 Pine Crescent</td>
<td>Resubmission required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3780 East Boulevard</td>
<td>Application refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645 West King Edward Avenue</td>
<td>Application cleared, PTR addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656 Laurier Avenue</td>
<td>Landscape Review &amp; Inspection cleared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1037 West King Edward Avenue</td>
<td>SHPOA outreach - not attended by City staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review of minutes:
N/A

The Panel considered one Application for presentation

1. Address: 1888 Matthews Avenue (3890 Cypress Street)
   Description: Renovation and addition to Pre-Date house
   Review: Application - first
   Architect: Farpoint Architecture
   Delegation: John Keen

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (2 in favor, 6 against)

Planning Comments:
This is a proposal for the retention of and additions to an existing Heritage A house. Proposed work includes the removal of a non-original accessory building. The vehicular access will then be relocated from Matthews Avenue to a pre-existing curb cut on Cypress Street allowing for the parking to be relocated to the basement level of the house. The drive access has been situated to avoid impact on mature landscape. A porch addition is proposed for the north Matthews Avenue elevation which engages with the existing porch wrapping the house on the two street exposed elevations. The house currently encroaches into the rear yard. Existing non-original additions further aggravate the non-conformity. This application proposes removal of non-original additions and replacement with a one storey rear addition. A dormer is being proposed above the non-original access stair to the top half story.
Questions to Panel:
1. Staff are seeking commentary from the panel relating to the general relationship between new additions and the Heritage A house, with particular reference to:
   a. the north and east elevations
   b. the shallow pitched dormer, and
   c. replacement of the original front entry door
   d. the relationship of the new lower patio area to the original entry porch

2. Given the Heritage A-merit of the existing house, staff are seeking commentary on the removal of the existing chimneys.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:
This is a corner side with a single-facing front yard. There are two existing chimneys inside the form which are proposed for removal in order to open up the house. The front of the house is being relocated to Matthews in order to create a private yard for children to play in. No plans are in place to move or rotate the house. Three curb cuts are currently in existence, with one of them belonging to an old round-about which has been decommissioned. The style of the house is Foursquare with beautiful brackets and roof details. Under the new Heritage Guidelines it will be possible to keep the skin of the house, so the only exterior alterations will be to pull out the windows to install double-glass. One of the exquisite things about the house is its incredibly strong cross-gable, and a cute dormer at the front. There is a connecting staircase which goes to the top floor, and will be moved over four feet in order to create efficiency. The attic has quite a bit of headroom, and will be transformed into a couple of bedrooms and a large playroom. An FSR relaxation request is being sought in order to minimize volume by adding floor space under a wrap-around porch. The expectation and hope is for this house to maintain its current character.

Landscape:
There are no trees being proposed for removal. There is a large bank of fifteen very wide neighbour trees which are being avoided for preservation purposes. A relaxation to extend the back yard is being requested.

Panel Commentary:
The panel likes the house design, however the rationale for moving the front entrance to the side is confusing and ill done. The new front entrance still looks like a side entrance and makes the house seem unbalanced. Front entrances should be grand, with a grand front yard. A stronger front stairway entrance and more landscaping might help to achieve this look.

Further to the above there were many comments that changing the address from Cypress to the side street of Matthews does not make sense.

There were comments that the added head room for the connecting interior stairs takes away from the strong roof. On the north elevation there is a transom which looks out of place. The roof on the east side over the porch has a small notch and should look like one idea, not one idea plus an addition. The new dormer is fighting with the other expressions, expressing this as a flat roof might fix this. The new skylights are open to the neighbours, and the south-facing upper left window has been moved too close to the triple brackets.

There was discussion about retaining the original beautiful leaded windows of the heritage house. One option for retaining the original windows is to fit a removable glass inset to the interior window frame to create a non-sealed double paned window. This type of low-tech double paned window has been used successfully elsewhere in the neighbourhood to retain original leaded windows.
The proposed front porch and window make an uncomfortable disconnect. A new porch should either encapsulate or avoid the bay window entirely. The new column design dilutes the effect of the front entrance and rather should match the other posts.

The Panel understands that the intent of moving the driveway is to protect the trees, however it still adds too much paving to the site. The fountain seems superfluous and is too close to the neighbours. More planting would provide a better buffer for the water feature and add greenery to the yard.

Overall the panel notes that the project makes a good attempt at heritage retention, and thinks that the applicant is being successful at maintaining the original character of the house.

Chair Summary:
The Panel applauds the retention efforts for this Heritage A house. The Panel is pleased to see a retention project that does not try to take over the lot but instead makes an effort to fit into the landscape and streetscape. There were comments that retaining the exterior skin of the house is a good thing. We want to see the original leaded windows retained and suggest they could be made more energy efficient by adding removable glass panels to the interior of the window frames as is done successfully in other heritage houses in FS.

There are concerns about changing the front elevation of the house to face Matthews as the original entrance on Cypress is more grand and is the original entrance. A new entrance on the side street would need more substantial landscaping and wider front stairs to pull it off, as currently the front of the house still looks like the side.

The windows onto the front porch need more design help, and the other new front elevation windows are too close to the front brackets. The new dormer should copy existing dormers or be flat, rather than introducing yet another roof style. The additions on the east side would be stronger if they were more simple in design. The removal of the chimneys is not a concern as they are no longer in use and their removal would open up the interior space. The Panel is in support of the wrap around porch.

While we support the retention of the trees, two thirds of the yard now looks paved. A new and more vigorous landscape plan is needed. Overall a strong job has been done in trying to maintain the character of the house, and the project deserves applause for its efforts towards heritage retention.

Adjournment:
There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 6:05pm.