



MINUTES
OAK BAY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL
TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 2016 AT 8:45 AM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MUNICIPAL HALL, 2167 OAK BAY AVENUE

MEMBERS PRESENT

Lynn Gordon-Finlay, Chair
John Armitage
James Kerr

Andrea Nemeth
David Wilkinson
Councillor Tom Croft

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

STAFF PRESENT

Deborah Jensen, Planner

Krista Mitchell, Building/Planning Clerk

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8:47 am.

2. Adoption of Minutes from April 5, 2016

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes from April 5, 2016 be adopted.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

3. Adoption of Minutes from May 3, 2016

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes from May 3, 2016 be adopted.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

4. Approval of Agenda and Late Items

The agenda was approved as presented.

5. New Business

- a. ADP00048 – 754 Mount Joy Avenue - Subdivision
To permit construction of a single family home.

M. Miller, owner, and R. Collins, applicant, presented the proposal to construct a new single family home. Some of the comments were:

- Providing a design that works with massing, house siting, and preservation of trees.
- House is sited so owners can have parking access directly from garage to main floor.
- This is a traditional designed home with heavy wooden trim, cedar shingles, eye brow roof, and true divided light windows that is oriented to the sunny portion of the lot.
- Design intended to save almost all of the significant trees.
- Landscape design will utilize interlocking pavers, and retaining walls will be used for the driveway and tree protection. Large boulders are sited to complement existing

rock and native vegetation. Floating permeable driveway and careful rock removal will help protect trees.

Panel Comments

Panel members requested clarification regarding the curved retaining wall, pathways between trees, tree disturbance around the main entrance, and driveway drainage.

M. Miller indicated a double step retaining wall provides ability to lower height of the residence and minimize blasting, pathway provides disabled access to building, and stairwell has been moved to minimize impact on trees. The applicant also indicated permeable, old stone aqua pavers will be used for the driveway and do not impact the tree root zones.

Panel members asked about the relationship of the proposed house to the neighbouring property and confirmed that six trees are being removed.

M. Miller stated the proposed house has minimal windows along the west side for privacy and the home is at a lower elevation than the neighbours. Both homes have primary windows facing south.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist		
Siting of Buildings		
1. Maintenance of residential park setting		Yes well managed
2. Setbacks		No issues
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area		In keeping
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development		Appropriate
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings		Siting favours tree protection over impact on neighborhood views.
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties		None
7. Overlook and privacy issues		None
8. Transition between private and public space		Good
9. Accessory buildings		N/A
Design of Buildings		
1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing		Traditional, fine
2. Roofscape (eg./Soffits, Fascias, Flashing)		Good, well done
3. Flashing		N/A
4. Lighting		Appropriate
5. Garages and Outbuildings		Attached
Landscaping		
1. Fencing and screening		None shown
2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material		Good
3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation		Good
4. Play and recreation areas		Great
5. Hard landscaping		Permeable pavers required in driveway
6. Parking and driveways		Extensive, but well handed.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00048.
 The motion was carried.
 None opposed.

- b. DVP00046 / ADP00049 –3280 Weald Road - Uplands Siting and Design
To permit construction of a single family home.

M. Whitney, applicant, gave a brief presentation. Some of the comments were

- The proposed home will have the garage sited at the rear of the property.
- Exterior will be smooth acrylic stucco for ease of maintenance and contemporary feel.
- The landscape plan will be fairly simple for low maintenance.

Panel Comments

Panel members requested clarification for the proposed variances and noted a pebbled dash stucco would be better suited to the building as the flat acrylic stucco weakens the design.

M. Whitney indicated the variance is for building height due to the three front dormers, and roof height meets zoning requirements.

Panel members noted there should be the appropriate level of detail and finishing on a grand house that does not include fake materials, and asked about the windows, dormers, soffits and gutters, and two gable ends.

M. Whitney responded that false dormers will give access to the attic space, the front half arched window will be obscured, windows are manufactured by Loewen, soffits will be smooth wood and gutters will be black aluminum. The applicant also indicated the two gable ends are used for aesthetics.

Panel members stated the property currently has a retaining wall and fencing, and questioned siting of a wrought iron fence along the front when Weald Road is quite open. The Panel suggested removing the existing retaining wall and restore the park like setting.

A Panel member commented the driveway is too wide and alters the rhythm of the street.

D. Jensen stated the driveway crossing would need to meet the driveway access bylaw.

A Panel member inquired about the removal of an oak tree.

D. Jensen noted that both the arborist report provided by the applicant and the District arborist state the tree has a healthy crown, but the roots are decaying.

The Panel members felt the level of details and materials for a house in this location of this stature are unresolved, noting:

- Relationship of the building to the ground is not well resolved.
- Belly band not well considered, perhaps raise it.
- Concern over the use of fake materials, house could be raised and clad in stone.
- Gables and fenestration detail is weak, consider soffits and gutters without aluminum.

The Panel was in support of the variance.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that DVP00046 / ADP00049 be tabled to a subsequent meeting of the Advisory Design Panel.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

- c. ADP00051 – 2695 Lansdowne Road – Uplands Siting and Design
To permit construction of a single family home.

R. Grohovac, applicant, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Creating a modern take on a traditional style home that fits into the park like setting.
- Sited approximately where the existing house is located.
- Majority of existing vegetation will be retained, boulevard trees will be added, and additional gardens added to Lansdowne side of property.
- Driveway will be relocated from Lansdowne Road to Midland Road.
- Board and batten style with router detail on the battens, along with silver grey salt and pepper cut granite.
- Trim, window casings, and fascia boards will be white, with wider casings above the crown. Front door and posts will be mahogany in a natural colour.
- Garage doors will be painted to blend into the siding on the house.

Panel Comments

Panel members inquired regarding the front door material, and noted the plans do not show location of gutters or indicate how board and batten stops, and suggested a water table strategy is required.

R. Grohovac stated the front door is tree farm mahogany, that no fencing is proposed for the street frontages, and that balcony railings will be painted white. He also stated battens will be smooth, with a hardi panel cement board, and real stone repeated around the corners.

The Panel members indicated the building is generally workable, but noted:

- If utilizing Midland as entry, then house needs to be reoriented and applicant to decide what is the front yard and rear yards, and provide access from Lansdowne.
- Massing and style is confusing; overall detail of house needs to be worked out, and clearly determine the style and materials of home being presented.
- Composition of house needs to reflect a formal high quality home.
- Drawings should include gutters.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that ADP00051 be tabled to a subsequent meeting of the Advisory Design Panel.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

- d. COV00001 – 2280 Estevan Avenue – Covenant Amendment – Siting and Design
To permit alterations to a previously approved duplex design.

C. Peterson, applicant, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Remove detached garage and site attached garage between the two units.
- One of the units will now have a private backyard and garden.
- More access to parking and reduced paving of the overall site. Trees are maintained.
- Provides exterior access to basement.

- Less impact on neighbour to north.
- Building materials same as original design, window trim changed from beige to black.

Panel Comments

Panel members commented that the proposed design is much improved over the original design, noting that the preference would be to remove the privacy screens for connection to the street, to provide weather cover for Unit 2, and to provide a separate pathway to the entry of each unit that is separate from vehicle access.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Approved
2. Setbacks	N/A
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Great
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Improvement
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Well considered
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	None
7. Overlook and privacy issues	Well handled
8. Transition between private and public space	Consider walkways to front door
9. Accessory buildings	N/A

Design of Buildings

1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Delightful
2. Roofscape (eg/Soffits, Fascias, Flashing)	Excellent
3. Flashing	N/A
4. Lighting	Well chosen
5. Garages and Outbuildings	Improved

Landscaping

1. Fencing and screening	Interesting
2. Preservation of Significant Healthy Trees and Plant Material	Yes
3. Native Plants, New Trees, and Vegetation	N/A
4. Play and recreation areas	Yes
5. Hard landscaping	Minimized
6. Parking and driveways	Reduced, conflicts resolved

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve COV00001.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

- e. OCP00002/ ZON00019/ DP000006 – 1632 Yale Street – OCP Amendment and Rezoning To permit construction of three single family homes.

B. Paterson, applicant, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Modified Lot 2 home to have 1 ½ storey design with attic on the second floor that breaks up rhythm between the three houses.
- Additional glazing has been applied to the Lot 3 home along Byron Street, ensuring privacy is protected.
- Exterior materials will be a solid stain or wash stain on the cedar.
- Rear yards will have fences and gates.
- Exterior lighting will utilize dark sky principles, consisting of soffit lighting in the canopy over the front door and garage, as it hits the ground.

A. Nemeth left the meeting at 10:57 am.

Panel Comments

Panel members indicated the modifications made since preliminary review by the Panel have improved the project and that the Lot 2 house fits nicely into the neighbourhood. The Panel also suggested utilizing simple, high quality hand rails, and installing a transom above the Lot 2 garage door to bring fenestration around the corner.

A panel member asked if heat pumps would be utilized.

B. Patterson stated a dual purpose boiler would be installed instead of heat pumps to minimize noise levels.

D. Jensen noted driveway access for all three homes does not conform to the engineering bylaws and would have to be modified.

B. Patterson stated visitor parking is limited, and the Yale Street roadway is narrow.

Panel members stated the project is a good demonstration of what can be done with density, that retention of the Lot 3 garage is a positive attribute, and the shared pathway between Lots 2 and 3 promotes neighbourly connections. The Panel noted the design was contemporary while taking on a traditional style.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Maintenance of pleasant residential street setting.
2. Setbacks	N/A
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Raising character up a notch.
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Welcome densification.
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Good
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	None
7. Overlook and privacy issues	Handled well.
8. Transition between private and public space	Add porches, patios space in front for interaction with street.
9. Accessory buildings	Single garage, extra parking would be supported.

Design of Buildings

1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Good variety
2. Roofscape (eg/Soffits, Fascias, Flashing)	Varied, interesting
3. Flashing	Appropriate
4. Lighting	Well considered
5. Garages and Outbuildings	See siting (9)

Landscaping

1. Fencing and screening	Well done
2. Preservation of Significant Healthy Trees and Plant Material	As much as possible, well done
3. Native Plants, New Trees, and Vegetation	Nicely done
4. Play and recreation areas	Excellent
5. Hard landscaping	Limited, will be arranged
6. Parking and driveways	See above

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve OCP00002 / ZON00019/ DP000006.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

- f. DP000007 – 1701 Beach Drive – Siting and Design
To permit renovations and additions to Glenlyon Norfolk School.

L. Gordon-Finlay advised that there is considered to be no conflict of interest for J. Armitage with respect to this application.

C. Rowe, applicant, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- At preliminary review, the central concern of the Advisory Design Panel was the connection between the historic Rattenbury house and the new school building.
- Improved the connection area by reopening connection through original breezeway.
- New window in end elevation.
- Façade has been changed from red brick to maroon dark red stain cedar shingles.
- Half timbered features on the house will be a buff colour, with shading fins a dark stained timber.
- Relocation of coach house opens up ocean view.
- Front door will be main entrance for students, administration and general public.
- The boat house and the kindergarten building will be shingles, not mock tudor.

A. Nemeth returned at 11:36 am.

Panel Comments

Panel members inquired as to the use of the forecourt and impact of the folded roof on the neighbours.

C. Rowe advised the forecourt will consist of permeable pavers utilized as a playground and access for emergency vehicles only, and that the grey weathered finish roof colour and angle of the roof are directed away from the neighbouring apartment building and will have no impact on neighbours.

C. Rowe noted 28 school staff currently park on the street, and the 29 new underground parking spaces will provide for staff parking and secure bike storage, meeting the parking bylaw requirements.

Panel members commented site improvements will enhance the waterfront, and noted that stone could be used to the left of the entrance but that the dark area on the second storey is still problematic.

Panel members inquired as to use of the coach house, and inquired as to the requested variances.

C. Rowe clarified the coach house will be used as the music room but is in poor shape and will need to be deconstructed and reconstructed in its new location.

C. Rowe noted three variances are requested, two for setbacks from Beach Drive, one for the coach house and one for the kindergarten building; and the third variance for the total of side yard setbacks.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Excellent
2. Setbacks	Variances are supported
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Dramatic and exceptional
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Big impact and well done
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Improvement
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	None
7. Overlook and privacy issues	None
8. Transition between private and public space	Complex and well handled
9. Accessory buildings	Campus well designed

Design of Buildings

1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Very different and should be
2. Roofscape (eg/Soffits, Fascias, Flashing)	Again dramatic, exceptional
3. Flashing	Appropriate
4. Lighting	As required for school
5. Garages and Outbuildings	N/A

Landscaping

1. Fencing and screening	Well landscaped
2. Preservation of Significant Healthy Trees and Plant Material	Excellent
3. Native Plants, New Trees, and Vegetation	Excellent
4. Play and recreation areas	Excellent
5. Hard landscaping	Excellent, appropriate for school
6. Parking and driveways	Great improvement for staff parking and parent drop off.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve DP000007.

The motion was carried.

J. Armitage opposed.

6. Information Items

a. Residential Infill Strategy – Designer’s Workshop

D. Jensen gave an update of the Residential Infill Strategy. Some of the comments were:

- Urban Form Associates and Ramsay Ward Architects have been retained as consultants for the project.
- Public engagement will begin in September, but a survey will be available over the summer months.
- A designer’s workshop is scheduled for June 28, 2016.

7. Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel is Tuesday, July 5, 2016.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:29 pm.