



MINUTES
OAK BAY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL
TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 2017 AT 8:45 AM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MUNICIPAL HALL, 2167 OAK BAY AVENUE

MEMBERS PRESENT

Kim Milburn
John Armitage
James Kerr

Will King
David Wilkinson
Councillor Tom Croft

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

STAFF PRESENT

Deborah Jensen, Manager of Planning
Graeme Buffet, Planning Technician
Krista Mitchell, Building and Planning Clerk

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8:51 am.

2. Adoption of Minutes from March 7, 2017

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes from March 7, 2017 be adopted as amended.
The motion was carried.
None opposed.

3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items

The agenda was approved as presented with the addition of two items from J. Kerr and J. Armitage as 6(a).

4. Old Business

- a) ADP00060 – 390 Beach Drive – Subdivision – Siting and Design
To permit construction of a single family home.

J. Boisvert and D. Gray, applicants, presented the revised proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Reduced size and changed colour of the main roof overhang.
- A steel structure has been added around the front door.
- Eliminated fascia board on the lower roof.
- Variance for height is not needed.

Panel Comments

Panel members inquired if the steel frame around the front door will have a canopy, whether second floor porch elements had changed, and asked about exterior lighting.

J. Boisvert, applicant, indicated the owners did not want a canopy over the front door, and that there will be minimal wall sconces with some soffit lighting. He also noted a

structural change resulted in two columns moving outside the building envelope, facing the street, with two additional columns located in the rear yard.

Panel members advised the columns should be made the same size, and suggested they be relocated so they would not block water views. Panel members also noted the driveway wheel strips could be made narrower to create more green space, that the grass strips could utilize different materials other than grass, and that wildlife habitat should be enhanced.

Panel members commented the front entry was a disappointment as the entry is not visible from the street, and it is lacking overhead shelter and is discordant from the rest of the building, and suggested adding plantings to the front entry area.

In summary, the Panel members noted the following suggestions to the applicant:

- The front canopy could benefit from comments made by the Panel.
- The front columns or wall elements should be uniform.
- Driveway tire strips should be narrower.
- Plantings should be placed on cables at the front entry.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

1. Maintenance of residential park setting	N.A.
2. Setbacks	Conforming
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Appropriate
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Appropriate
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Good
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	Negligible
7. Overlook and privacy issues	Well handled
8. Transition between private and public space	Open driveway has marker at side entry – acceptable
9. Accessory buildings	Acceptable

Design of Buildings

1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Good
2. Roofscape	Roof overhang / soffits acceptable
3. Flashing	Acceptable
4. Lighting	Dark sky principles generally considered
5. Garages and outbuildings	Acceptable

Landscaping

1. Fencing and screening	Good
2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	N/A
3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	Acceptable
4. Play and recreation areas	Good
5. Hard landscaping	Acceptable
6. Parking and driveways	Narrowing of wheel strips recommended.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00060.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

T. Croft left the meeting at 9:34 am and returned at 9:37 am.

5. New Business

- a) ADP00068 – 3355 Midland Road – Uplands Siting and Design
To permit construction of a single family home.

L. Cecco, applicant, presented the proposed revisions to the house currently under construction. Some of the comments were:

- House design previously approved by Council is currently under construction.
- Applicants wish to delete top floor from design so overall height of steel structure has been reduced by one metre, reducing height and massing, providing a tall main floor.
- The gazebo has been deleted, the accessory building is sited the same.
- Roof is cambered standing seam metal, soffit is solid colour long board aluminum.
- Honed and polished stone, and bush hammered are the same as what was approved.
- Stone fascia band at ground floor window height.

Panel Comments

Panel members inquired about the type of stone used for exterior cladding and driveway width, and commented the massing looks better being lowered.

L. Cecco, applicant, noted limestone is used for exterior cladding, a mix of tyndall stone and dolomite, with tyndall mainly used at the entrance section. He also commented this is a part 3 building, so driveway is five metres wide at entrance for emergency vehicles.

Panel members commented that the massing looks better now with the house being lower down. The eye brow elements clad should be stone are to be resolved by the applicant.

Panel members complimented the applicant for the green roof on the accessory building and suggested the applicant consider doing the same for the main building. They also noted the accessory building is well handled with great detailing.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Well considered
2. Setbacks	Conforming and acceptable
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Appropriate
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Good
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Good
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	Negligible
7. Overlook and privacy issues	Negligible
8. Transition between private and public space	Good
9. Accessory buildings	Good

Design of Buildings

1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Well handled
2. Roofscape	Good
3. Flashing	Acceptable
4. Lighting	Assumed to meet dark sky principles
5. Garages and outbuildings	acceptable

Landscaping

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

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00068.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

b) ADP00069 – 3155 Beach Drive - Uplands Siting and Design

To permit final revisions to the design of a newly constructed single family home.

T. Williams, applicant, presented the revised proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Owners wanted to utilize elements from the previously approved original design, so minor changes were made to the design approved by ADP.
- The materials are the same as previously approved.

D. Jensen commented the building inspector had determined a number of discrepancies from what was recommended and approved by ADP and Council.

Panel Comments

Panel members commented that the changes were done away from the scheme that had been recommended and approved by the Advisory Design Panel and Council, and that while the changes were impressive and did not affect massing, there is a long list of discrepancies.

Panel members stated it was disconcerting how much staff time has been spent on this application, noting an incredible amount of time was taken away from regular duties for the building inspector and the planning department. They also commented that the renderings were not well done, and so the application had previously struggled through the Design Panel process where the designer had remained anonymous.

Panel members noted the materials for the final construction had come together better than expected, as seen through the photographs, and that changes improving the design included muntin bar and soffit layouts, and north elevation window design. They also commented that some details are not done well and look phony, such as the window trim; and noted the largest problem is the massing of the fascia on the end of the deck that has increased from the previous drawings, and that the size of the deck columns is inconsistent with other features and the glass does not pull it together. The Panel members noted this area is visible from the ocean, which is more important than being visible from the street as the front is blocked by trees.

T. Williams, applicant, commented that it was the owner's choice to vary away from the ADP approved wrought iron railing on the deck and replace it with the glass as the owners wanted the water view and be able to block the wind.

Panel members commented the applicant took a risk with varying the approved, but generally the overall the design is approvable.

Panel members commented the correct process for varying from the approved building permit is to return to the Advisory Design Panel with proposed revisions. Panel members also expressed concern about setting a precedent as the construction project managers took a huge risk, and suggested mechanisms should be explored to stop this type of activity, such as placing a notice on title.

D. Jensen noted this is a difficult process where the revisions result in a situation where the house is now in contravention of the Uplands Bylaw and Special Powers Act. She also noted it is difficult to determine where building inspectors should be involved with respect to detailed review of building plans, design and materials during the construction process.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

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

Design of Buildings

1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Appropriate
2. Roofscape	Appropriate
3. Flashing	Good
4. Lighting	Acceptable
5. Garages and outbuildings	N.A.

Landscaping

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

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00069.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

6. Information Items

Panel members indicated they would like to establish policies or guidelines respecting dark sky principles, noting it would be helpful to provide a diagram of a typical house and where lights should be placed.

D. Jensen commented that a sustainability checklist is being prepared and dark sky principles could be incorporated into that document.

W. King departed at 10:53 am.

Panel members commented they are noticing applications with inconsistency of plans, for example lacking roof plans and sections, and would prefer the applicant have architectural or design experience to be able to engage with the Panel. Panel members noted the lack of information and inconsistency results in delays and additional staff and Panel time.

D. Jensen noted that some of these items could be incorporated into the application form and discussed with the applicant at preapplication meetings. She also noted a voluntary waiver

has been added to the application form that, when signed, would allow staff to release floor plans.

Panel members commented the design guidelines set out in the Uplands brochure need more clarity; and noted that the vision for Uplands is changing and it needs to be discussed what guidelines are important.

T. Croft commented that Council has discretion for land use and design in the Uplands.

7. Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Tuesday, May 2, 2017.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:21 am.