



MINUTES
OAK BAY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 2016 AT 8:45 AM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MUNICIPAL HALL, 2167 OAK BAY AVENUE

MEMBERS PRESENT

Lynn Gordon-Finlay, Chair
John Armitage

MEMBERS ABSENT

James Kerr
David Wilkinson

STAFF PRESENT

Deborah Jensen, Manager of Planning Krista Mitchell, Building / Planning Clerk

1. Call to Order

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

2. Adoption of Minutes from July 5, 2016

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

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items

The agenda was approved as presented.

4. Information Items

None.

5. Old Business

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

M. Whitney, applicant, presented the revised proposal. Some of the comments were:

- The front yard setback has been increased, roof lines have been lowered by three (3) feet, exterior trim has been changed to wood.
- Lowered main floor elevation and removed retaining wall at front.

Panel Comments

Panel members confirmed driveway width at 12 feet, with 15 feet at crossing, and noted the modification from a two storey home to a 1 ½ storey home was appropriate.

In summary, the Panel members noted the following:

- Increased setback and front elevation is a better fit with other adjacent homes.
- The windows will have a divider inside the glass, not individual panes of glass.
- Could explore broadening lower column width and eliminating band at pilaster.
- Downspouts could be wrapped around the corner.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Maintenance of residential park setting | Improvement |
| 2. Setbacks | |
| 3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area | Improved massing in response to neighbours. |
| 4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development | Improved –more sympathetic to context |
| 5. Relationship to adjacent buildings | Improved |
| 6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties | Minimal |
| 7. Overlook and privacy issues | Minimal |
| 8. Transition between private and public space | Improved |
| 9. Accessory buildings | n/a |

Design of Buildings

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| 1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing | Improved |
| 2. Roofscape (eg./Soffits, Fascias, Flashing) | Improved |
| 3. Flashing | Not discussed |
| 4. Lighting | Not discussed - see previous |
| 5. Garages and Outbuildings | n/a |

Landscaping – not changed from previous submission

| | |
|---|-------------|
| 1. Fencing and screening | Appropriate |
| 2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material | |
| 3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation | |
| 4. Play and recreation areas | |
| 5. Hard landscaping | |
| 6. Parking and driveways | |

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00049.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

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

R. Grohvac, applicant, and N. Banks presented the revised proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Front walkway added to Lansdowne Road, driveway screened from Lansdowne Road.
- Elevations have been modified and rooflines and gables used to downplay overall massing and to tie elements together.
- Three large existing maple trees somewhat obscure the house.

Panel Comments

Panel members commented that a roof plan should be submitted with reconsideration given to the roof lines, elevations are not coordinated, for example, granite does not wrap around, and there is inconsistency in the details of the drawings. Panel members also confirmed the use of wood board and batten, wall shingles of real cedar in a semi-transparent stain, and 6"-7" thick granite supported by a 5"x5" angle bar.

Panel members suggested introducing a belly band on the west and rear elevation, confirm parking requirements, consider using thin stone veneer, and reconsider the purpose of the meandering pathway from the front door to the garage. They determined the overall application was supportable, however the roof lines need to be resolved and more detail is required on stone treatment.

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.

6. New Business

- a. ADP00054 – 2755 Lincoln Road – Uplands Siting and Design
To permit construction of a single family home.

N. Banks, applicant, gave a presentation of the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Proposing a 1 ½ storey traditional style home with simple exterior and increased side yard setbacks to provide greater separation from neighbours.
- Driveway will be constructed of concrete strips and shifted to the south for improved protection of the existing boulevard trees.
- Ornamental trees will be removed, and accessory building will be sited in the rear yard.
- Garage will be set back to provide some articulation of the home, accessory building designed to match house.

Panel Comments

Panel members confirmed the accessory building will have a hip roof that matches the house, and exterior finishes will include smooth acrylic stucco with painted wood trim. Panel members also suggested soffits incorporate stucco in a lighter shade from the house colour, columns include additional stone, the hip roof over the garage be removed, and that dark sky principles be utilized.

N. Banks advised pot lights will be used above the garage doors.

A Panel member acknowledged this family home has been designed to accommodate aging in place, but suggested wider doorways, pedestrian lighting, and narrowing the width of the driveway.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

| | |
|---|--|
| 1. Maintenance of residential park setting | Very little change to landscaping. Smaller footprint house. |
| 2. Setbacks | Improvement |
| 3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area | Appropriate |
| 4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development | In keeping |
| 5. Relationship to adjacent buildings | Different but sympathetic |
| 6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties | None |
| 7. Overlook and privacy issues | None |
| 8. Transition between private and public space | Minimize driveway width |
| 9. Accessory buildings | Simple, in keeping |

Design of Buildings

| | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| 1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing | Good |
| 2. Roofscape (eg./Soffits, Fascias, Flashing) | Suggest soffits are white stucco |
| 3. Flashing | To match trim |
| 4. Lighting | Dark sky principles |
| 5. Garages and Outbuildings | Appropriate |

Landscaping

| | |
|---|--|
| 1. Fencing and screening | Note: no landscaping plan |
| 2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material | At permit-review tree impact at new driveway location. |
| 3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation | Insufficient information |
| 4. Play and recreation areas | Back patio not shown. Consider micro climate |
| 5. Hard landscaping | Appropriate |
| 6. Parking and driveways | Appropriate |

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00054.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

D. Wilkinson left the meeting at 10:15 am.

- b. ADP00055 – 3175 Midland Road – Uplands Siting and Design
To permit an addition and renovations to a single family home.

D. Wilkinson returned to the meeting at 10:18 am.

S. Makin, applicant, and A. Meisen, owner, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Applicants are renovating this rancher home to age in place, including interior renovations and a small addition and deck added to the footprint.
- No trees will be affected, and no variances are required.
- One Garry oak has already been reviewed by an arborist, but will be further inspected in order to ensure its health.

D. Jensen confirmed the applicant had revised plans so that variances were not required for the proposed works.

Panel Comments

Panel members confirmed a fence will run along the side property line, and that exterior materials will include ivory stucco, white vinyl perforated vented soffit, new windows at same elevation, and slate gutter material appropriate to the roof.

Panel members suggested using cream stucco with white windows and cream trim and sill. They also recommended full glazing for addition instead of large windows, using fir for garage doors and front door, and wood soffits.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

| | |
|---|--|
| 1. Maintenance of residential park setting | Commendation for preserving existing house. |
| 2. Setbacks | No variances/small addition with setbacks. |
| 3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area | No change |
| 4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development | No change |
| 5. Relationship to adjacent buildings | No change |
| 6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties | None |
| 7. Overlook and privacy issues | None |
| 8. Transition between private and public space | Encourage adaptable route from street to entry or from interior to patio |
| 9. Accessory buildings | N/A |

Design of Buildings

| | |
|--|---|
| 1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing | No change |
| 2. Rooftop (eg./Soffits, Fascias, Flashing) | Colour scheme- dark roof and gutter works well. |
| 3. Flashing | Appropriate |
| 4. Lighting | No issues |
| 5. Garages and Outbuildings | Part of residence |

Landscaping

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| 1. Fencing and screening | Minimal |
| 2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material | Yes |
| 3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation | No change |
| 4. Play and recreation areas | Large patio in rear |
| 5. Hard landscaping | Minimal |
| 6. Parking and driveways | No change |

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00055.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

T. Croft departed the meeting at 10:56 am

D. Jensen provided an update on the Residential Infill Strategy process, advising the discussion at the Designers Workshop was productive, and two public open houses are scheduled for September 10, 2016 at the University of Victoria. The open houses will introduce the strategy and discuss what infill is. This will be followed up with further public engagement, such as a design charrette.

7. Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel is Tuesday, October 4, 2016.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:06 am.