1. 1645 West King Edward Ave. (Application - first)
BUSINESS MEETING
Chair Collins called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm and noted the presence of a quorum.

Business:
Concerns were expressed with regard to 1664 Cedar Crescent and the possible development in the future beyond the FSR allowable of attic space and a crawl space in the basement. Tim Potter put forward a Planning Department recommendation to vault the attic space and to remove the windows from the exterior walls of the crawl space area. The Panel agreed with Planning that these suggestions would resolve the issue.

Project Updates:
1250 Wolfe Avenue  New house: Application received
1998 Cedar Crescent  Director of Planning permit refusal based on Temporary Protection Order. The refusal will be challenged at the Board of Variance.
4033 Osler Street  Non-Sufficient Character Merit: Support for New House proposal

Review of minutes:
N/A

The Panel considered one application for presentation

1. Address: 1645 West King Edward Avenue
Description: New House on a Post-Date Site
Review: Application (first)
Architect: Bill McCreery, City Build Architecture
Delegation: Bill McCreery, Julie Hicks, Viewpoint Landscape Architecture

EVALUATION: NON SUPPORT (2 in favor, 9 against)

Planning Comments:
This is a proposal for a new house on a post-date site in mid-block facing West King Edward Ave. Existing lane access to the rear of the property from the lane to the North will be maintained, and a new vehicular crossing from W. King Edward Ave is proposed. The location of the crossing requires Park Board approval for removal/relocation of an existing fruit tree, and a total of four other trees are proposed to be removed to facilitate redevelopment. Underground parking within the new house envelope is proposed, with maneuvering space in the rear yard. The new house is centrally located on the lot and demonstrates a tripartite expression with a prominent street facing gable massing.
Questions to Panel:
1. Can the panel comment on the success of the architectural and landscape design proposals as they relate to the expectations of the FS ODP & Guidelines?
2. Can the panel offer commentary specifically around landscape proposals as they relate to vehicular access arrangements to the front and rear of the dwelling?

Applicant's Introductory Comments:
This Shaughnessy property is a long and narrow rectangle, 82 feet wide and 200 feet long. The house has been designed to suit the property and its dimensions. The massing of the house is high at the front and lower at the back in order to encourage sunlight capture in the backyard. There is a port cochère accessible from King Edward which requires a new crossing that has been approved by the City’s Engineering Department. The house uses a tripartite design with a stone base and 6” bevel-cedar siding. The roof shingles on top of the house are treated cedar. There is a gently curved fence on the King Edward side of the building with low planting and trees on the outside of the fence. The front fence is a wrought-iron fence on top of a low stone wall. The front driveway has a setback to allow vehicle waiting space while the gates open.

Landscape:
The front yard has low planting in front of the fence, and the front curve landscaping is made up of columnar beech trees. A reflecting pool will be installed opposite the port cochère. The landscape responds to the central access of house design and includes a gazebo as a focal point in the backyard. Additional planting of columnar hornbeams is planned in the west side yard to create more scale, and the patio has been pulled to the east to compensate. Terracing on the driveway has been set back to allow for maximum garden space. We have suggested that the surrounding hedge be completely replanted with a new evergreen hedge to provide privacy and look neat. No landscape excavation will be done in the zone of the neighbor’s dogwood tree in order to protect the roots.

Panel Commentary:
It was commented that more design work is needed on the house. A more prominent front door, taller and larger chimneys, and a more robust porch space and port cochère would help achieve this.

There was discussion about the exterior colors being too complicated and jarring in appearance giving a striped look to the house. The colors need to be more simple and subtle. One or two colors would be better than many colors. The color scheme with the Craftsman style gives the house the appearance of a house in Kitsilano or Strathcona.

There was concern about the design of the back of the house not working with the back yard. The massing of the house and incorporation with the back yard makes the rear appear awkward and disjointed. The shed in the back yard looks like an add-on and is in need of design help.

The round library window in the front also takes away from the strength of the house and should be redesigned in a more robust fashion.

The driveway seems very convoluted and overwhelming; concerns were raised by the Panel about the design encouraging vehicles to park in the front driveway. The panel suggested that the driveway could be downsized to reduce prominence and dissuade front yard parking concerns.
There were comments that more landscaping is needed along the outer edges of the property as the current overall effect is too permeable. More trees particularly evergreens are required in the front area to reduce house visibility from the street. Additional tree planting on the sides would also create a better buffer between the property and its neighbours.

**Chair Summary:**
The Panel is in support of the cedar shingle roof and the driveway entrance from West King Edward with the port cochère. The current style proposed is trying to be Craftsman but is not reflecting that style well. However, a more robust and attractive front door and better design work with heavier features on the chimneys and port cochère would help with this. The round library window on the front elevation is out of proportion to the design of the house, the window needs to be more substantial to reflect the First Shaughnessy neighbourhood. The proposed roof material over this window of “some type of epoxy” does not fit with the neighbourhood or the Design Guidelines. A consistent roof material would work better here, perhaps a continuation of the cedar shingles proposed for the main roof. The rear of the house appears disjointed and needs to incorporate better with the back yard.

The proposed color choices are an issue here. There are too many colors and the colors chosen appear too bright. One or two colors in more muted tones would be preferable. In terms of landscaping, more evergreens are needed in the front yard to combat the sparse feel that will be projected in the winter months. The front yard would benefit with more layering and filigree as outlined in the Design Guidelines. More planting including evergreens in the side yards would also provide a better buffer with the neighbours. The basic design of the house is a place to start but requires much more architectural design work and detailing to bring it up to First Shaughnessy design standards.

**Adjournment:**
There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 5:45 pm.