



MINUTES
OAK BAY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2016 AT 8:45 AM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MUNICIPAL HALL, 2167 OAK BAY AVENUE

MEMBERS PRESENT

John Armitage
James Kerr
David Wilkinson

MEMBERS ABSENT

Councillor Tom Croft
Lynn Gordon-Finlay

STAFF PRESENT

Deborah Jensen, Manager of Planning Roy Thomassen, Director of Building and 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 September 6, 2016

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes from September 6, 2016 be adopted.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items

a) Residential Infill Strategy – Update

D. Jensen gave a brief summary of the two Residential Infill Strategy open houses held on September 10, 2016 indicating the sessions were well attended with approximately 85 people at each session. She advised comments forms are available online or in hard copy at the Building and Planning Department until October 7, 2016.

4. Information Items

None.

5. Old Business

a. DVP00044 / ADP00050 – 2985 Rutland Road - Uplands Siting and Design

To permit an addition to a single family home.

Variances are requested.

W. Peereboom, applicant, presented the revised proposal, noting they have amended the design from a contemporary 50's bungalow to a more traditional design in keeping with Uplands. Modifications include reducing front gables, realigning windows and heavy wood railings, while still proceeding with the proposed rock and shingles.

Panel Comments

Panel members confirmed that wood shingles will be used as the principal wall material, to wrap around the corner, and windows will be vinyl. Panel members suggested the soffit match the house colour, windows be aligned, and top fascia be consistently handled; and asked for confirmation regarding tree retention.

The applicant noted the large pine tree is problematic for maintenance issues, but would consider retaining it for privacy concerns.

D. Jensen advised the proposed building encroaches into the critical root zone of the tree, and the tree may not survive.

In summary, the Panel members noted the following:

- Eliminate belly band.
- Delete corner trim and wrap shingles around corners.
- Front elevation panels to align with windows.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Acceptable
2. Setbacks	Acceptable
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Acceptable
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Acceptable
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Acceptable
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	N/A
7. Overlook and privacy issues	N/A
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	Acceptable
2. Roofscape (eg./Soffits, Fascias, Flashing)	Acceptable but with panel soffit painted.
3. Flashing	OK
4. Lighting	OK
5. Garages and Outbuildings	N/A

Landscaping

1. Fencing and screening	Acceptable
2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	Pine tree may be retained if healthy
3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	Acceptable
4. Play and recreation areas	Acceptable
5. Hard landscaping	Acceptable
6. Parking and driveways	Acceptable

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve DVP00044 / ADP00050.
The motion was carried.
None opposed.

6. New Business

- a. DVP00051 / ADP00053 – 3450 Upper Terrace Road – Uplands Siting and Design
To permit enclosure of a deck.
Variances are requested.

S. Bonet, applicant, gave a presentation of the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Providing a sheltered area over the existing rear patio for year round use.
- Existing footprint will not change as patio cover will be built on top of current patio.
- Structure is a combination of three separate roofs consisting of solid roof, torch on, and three skylights with colour and materials matching the house.
- Fireplace will be clad in stone and provides privacy to the property to the north.
- Beams, rafters and columns to be painted in an off white.
- Variance requested for side yard setbacks as patio is in setback and is nonconforming.

Panel Comments

Panel members inquired about exterior lighting and fireplace venting, and suggested timber frame and posts match light grey house colour.

S. Bonet confirmed post lights will shine down and in toward deck, and fireplace is direct gas vent.

In summary, the Panel members noted the following:

- Delete the upper portion of fireplace chimney.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Acceptable
2. Setbacks	Increased non-conformance as per variance required is acceptable.
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Acceptable
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Acceptable
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Acceptable
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	N/A
7. Overlook and privacy issues	Well considered
8. Transition between private and public space	N/A
9. Accessory buildings	N/A

Design of Buildings

1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Acceptable
2. Roofscape (eg./Soffits, Fascias, Flashing)	Acceptable
3. Flashing	Acceptable
4. Lighting	Dark sky principles apply
5. Garages and Outbuildings	N/A

Landscaping

1. Fencing and screening	N/A
2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	N/A
3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	N/A
4. Play and recreation areas	N/A
5. Hard landscaping	No change
6. Parking and driveways	N/A

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve DVP00051 / ADP00053.
The motion was carried.
None opposed.

- b. ADP00056– 3290 Norfolk Road – Uplands Siting and Design
To permit modifications to a single family home currently under construction.

A. Mavrikos, owner and G. Mann, gave a brief summary of the proposed modifications. Some of the comments were:

- Add a retaining wall along pathway to the mudroom, and change style of mudroom door and rear garage door to allow more natural light and privacy, respectively.
- Change three single garage doors to a double and single garage door for better access.

Panel Comments

Panel members inquired about drainage, mudroom door changes, and retaining wall design. It was also suggested that all steps be eliminated into the mudroom, not just decreased as this would increase the accessibility to the rest of the house.

G. Mann stated that the door will include more glass to allow for natural light, but is inset so it is not visible from the road. He also advised the concrete retaining wall will not be more than two feet in height, a guard rail is not needed, and landscaping will be installed in front of the wall.

R. Thomassen advised drainage must be addressed as part of the development.

D. Jensen noted the boulevard retaining wall would need an encroachment agreement.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Acceptable
2. Setbacks	No change.
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Acceptable
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Acceptable
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Acceptable
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	Acceptable
7. Overlook and privacy issues	Reinstate north hedge buffer.
8. Transition between private and public space	Acceptable
9. Accessory buildings	N/A

Design of Buildings

1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Acceptable
2. Roofscape (eg./Soffits, Fascias, Flashing)	No change
3. Flashing	No change
4. Lighting	No change
5. Garages and Outbuildings	Changes to doors acceptable

Landscaping

1. Fencing and screening	See item 7 on page 1
2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	No change
3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	No change
4. Play and recreation areas	No change
5. Hard landscaping	No change
6. Parking and driveways	Drainage of driveway and turnaround to be resolved.

In summary, the Panel members noted the following:

- Consider removing stairs from the pathway leading to the mudroom door.
- Landscaped area along north property line to be included on plans and drawings.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00056.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

- c. PL190 / PL191 – 2326 Oak Bay Avenue – Preliminary Review
To permit a multifamily development.

K. Colpman, applicant, gave a presentation of the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Original application tabled until the Official Community Plan was adopted.
- Revised proposal meets the OCP design guidelines.
- The property to the north of the site is aware of the multifamily proposal.
- Completed a community impact study, notifying 160 homes, and approximately 98% of the residents provided support.

P. Johannknecht, architect, gave a presentation of the proposed design. Some of the comments were:

- The OCP recognizes opportunities along Oak Bay Avenue and proximity to the village, and this development is the 'missing tooth' in the row of mixed use development.
- Building to be sited between two four-storey buildings with 19 underground parking stalls, including three smart car stalls, and recycling.
- 14 residential units offer aging in place and setbacks have been increased on all four sides with building materials consisting of cedar, stucco and metal panels.
- The roof will have generous cantilevers as well as a community garden space.
- A shadow study shows the building will give minimal shadowing during the winter months and no effect during the summer months.
- Landscaping will include as much vegetation as possible to create an attractive streetscape, a rain garden will be installed, permeable pavers will be utilized for patio areas, and front sidewalk will be widened for pedestrians.
- Front lobby will be open and light, with a water feature and small plaza style design.
- The proposal will be LEED certified.

Panel Comments

Panel members commented this is a good project, the use of public and private space is well done, and the widened front sidewalk is an asset, but questioned the parking.

P. Johannknecht advised a traffic study indicates ample street parking for guests, with resident parking provided in secure underground parking. He also advised the parking ramp will be wall illuminated, the entry water feature is approximately 2 ½ feet in height, and secure bicycle storage and water filtration system will be included.

Panel members suggested the parking ramp could be narrowed to allow for single lane access and egress, and suggested the use of a decorative screen to assist with privacy along the north side.

Panel members inquired about the Garry oak tree on the neighbouring property, encouraging retention of the tree as a community benefit, indicating a reduction in underground parking is a balance to saving the tree.

The arborist for the applicant indicated the critical root zone of the oak tree covers approximately one quarter of the subject property, and indicated the tree is an elderly tree.

The Panel provided the following summary comments:

- Attempts should be made to retain the tree as a community benefit, and opportunity to do this through revising the underground parking area; but also need alternate plan if tree does not survive.
 - Good design for multifamily along Oak Bay Avenue, suggest wrapping north ground floor units so not all in shade.
 - Consider utilizing one of the at grade units as a townhouse unit with individual access.
- d. ZON00023 / DP000013 – 2296 Cadboro Bay Road - Preliminary Review
To permit a mixed use commercial – multifamily development.
Includes 2258 / 2268 / 2276/ 2296 Cadboro Bay Road and 2247 Bowker Avenue

M. Miller, applicant and G. Damant, architect, gave a presentation of the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Proposed development is at the end of a peninsula of multifamily developments along Cadboro Bay Road and is designated as a Secondary Village, intended to fill a gap for commercial uses between Estevan Village and Foul Bay Road.
- 49 residential units and 6 commercial units proposed in a four storey building, which has been developed in consultation with the local neighbourhood. Neighbours want a landmark social centre for the community, but are concerned about traffic and parking.
- A 'v' shape design is proposed given the shape of the site with larger massing along Cadboro Bay Road.
- The front of the building will be set back at grade to allow wider sidewalks and a pedestrian zone on Cadboro Bay Road, and no commercial use is proposed along Bowker Avenue where the design reflects a four storey brownstone building.
- 46 resident, four visitor and 51 bicycle parking stalls provided in underground parking.
- The contemporary building will incorporate brick and steel box window treatments, with fully glazed stairs and lobby to break up building massing.
- The applicant is proposing community contributions toward upgrade of the Cadboro Bay Road and Bowker Avenue intersection, as well as widening of the sidewalk.
- Landscape design will include sidewalks around the property, traffic bulges to slow traffic, trees installed along the streetscape, and a raised patio and large courtyard for gathering spaces.
- The site is located in the Bowker Creek watershed and runoff from the building surfaces will be treated in the rain gardens.
- Existing native and non-native trees, including six Garry oaks, will be removed and replaced with 14 Garry oak trees and 34 other assorted trees.

Panel Comments

Panel members suggested the Bowker Avenue design could be three storey individual access townhouses as compared to the 'cliff face' that does not respond to the existing neighbourhood condition, and that the north wing could potentially be completely removed.

R. Thomassen confirmed that an OCP amendment would be needed for the proposed live/work use on the southwest portion of the site.

Panel members commented on the large roof area and suggested a green roof could be a community benefit.

M. Miller advised insurance is an issue for a wood frame residential building that incorporates a green roof.

Panel members noted the proposal sets a high standard for the community, and will make for a more inviting corner, but there is a challenge for transitioning to the smaller homes on Bowker Avenue.

M. Miller commented the neighbours expressed a desire for a walkable community as it feels disconnected from commercial amenities, and that sun shadowing was a concern.

Panel members suggested the density is pushing the envelope, and recommended consideration be given to increased setbacks at the western end of the development, transitioning down to single family on the Bowker Avenue side of the development, and sculpting the fourth floor to be scaled back and a different style. They also indicated they were in favour of the glazing, the lantern, at the top of the building as it claims ownership of the neighbourhood.

The Panel provided the following summary comments:

- Good use of Cadboro Bay Road for providing commercial space and gathering space.
- Density is high along Bowker Avenue and the western portion of Cadboro Bay Road where it should transition to the existing apartment buildings, and this could be done through increased setbacks and more green space.
- Building on Bowker Avenue needs to find appropriate transition to the existing cottage homes, could be done through townhousing or sculpting the fourth storey.
- Could consider reducing the scale of development along Bowker Avenue and introducing a penthouse level.
- Utilize a lighter colour / material treatment to reduce mass and volume.

7. Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel is Tuesday, November 1, 2016.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:08 pm.