



MINUTES
OAK BAY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL
TUESDAY, JUNE 6, 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

MEMBERS ABSENT

Councillor Tom Croft

STAFF PRESENT

Deborah Jensen, Manager of Planning
Graeme Buffett, Planning Technician

Krista Mitchell, Building and Planning Clerk

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8:45 am.

2. Adoption of Minutes from May 2, 2017

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes from May 2, 2017 be adopted as amended.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items

The agenda was approved as presented.

4. Old Business

- a) ADP00062 – 3165 Midland Road – Uplands Siting and Design
To permit construction of a single family home.

T. Martin, applicant, and H. Donais, owner, presented the revised proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Foundation changed to board form concrete, ceiling and roof will be spray foam insulation.
- Roof and flashing details have been modified, and soffits changed to painted wood.
- Front beams made from aluminum, so now waterproof.
- Fireplace on rear elevation moved to the left; no fencing is planned.

Panel Comments

Panel members recognizes the revisions that have been made in response to Panel comments, and confirmed that the rear deck will be cantilevered concrete.

In summary, the Panel members noted that the application could be supported with the following recommendations:

- Main roof to be foam insulated, not vented; fence removed; fireplace moved south.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Achieved
2. Setbacks	Appropriate
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	Appropriate
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	Negligible
7. Overlook and privacy issues	Negligible
8. Transition between private and public space	Appropriate
9. Accessory buildings	N/A

Design of Buildings

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

Landscaping

1. Fencing and screening	None
2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	As per arborists report; many ex trees retained.
3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	Minimal new planting
4. Play and recreation areas	Good
5. Hard landscaping	Good
6. Parking and driveways	Appropriate

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

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

5. New Business

- a) ADP00070 – 3140 Tarn Place – Uplands Siting and Design
To permit construction of a single family home.

F. D'Ambrosio, architect, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Awkward site has led to a proposed circular home, which will not be readily apparent from most vantage points; home is oriented to take advantage of views.
- Architectural form, materials and colour palette of the home defer to the verdant surroundings and intended landscape architecture for the site.
- House will be clad in vertical board and batten of charred Western Red cedar, and high quality windows will be encased in a trim board.
- Existing hedge runs along the front of the home, which the owners wish to retain for privacy, with a sunny spot on the street side of the property.
- Central skylight with shading and baffling devices to redirect the light.
- Raised the platform of the house, which allows a better view over the rock outcropping.

T. Rusnak and I. Gallant, landscape architects, presented the proposed landscape plan. Some of the comments were:

- Site has mature landscaping that will be retained as much as possible, by lifting and storing plants off site, and then replanted in the final planting regime.

- Existing driveway location to remain.
- Still determining if evergreen hedges will be removed or replaced; and eucalyptus tree and other invasive species will be removed and replanted with native species.

Panel Comments

Panel members inquired about the proposed garage and exterior details of the home.

F. D'Ambrosio, architect, commented the proposed two car garage may have doors installed, and the exterior treatment will be the same as the house, and connected to the house by a wood trellis painted in a grey colour and possibly covered in wisteria. He also noted the flashing will have minimal expression, the parapet would slope back onto the roof, and exterior details is traditional with 4" board and 2" batten every two boards.

Panel members advised that fences and hedges are not consistent with the original parklike design intent for Uplands and, with its siting on a quiet cul de sac, noted that a gate and hedge is not needed and the hedge could be removed.

F. D'Ambrosio, architect, reiterated the owners would like a gate and hedge for additional privacy and security, but the existing hedge might be removed or reduced once the owners see the how the plantings behind the hedge offer privacy and security.

The Panel again recommended the applicant revisit the landscape treatment along Tarn Place to make it more transparent and open, while still providing security and privacy.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Maintenance of residential park setting | Appropriate, well handled |
| 2. Setbacks | Satisfactory |
| 3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area | Good |
| 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 | Improvements to front (street) landscape and gate treatment is recommended. |
| 9. Accessory buildings | Carport is appropriate |

Design of Buildings

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing | Distinct form is well considered for geometry challenged site. |
| 2. Roofscape | Appropriate |
| 3. Flashing | Appropriate |
| 4. Lighting | Appropriate |
| 5. Garages and outbuildings | Well-handled and complementary to house. |

Landscaping

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Fencing and screening | Further consideration of front hedge and gate recommended. |
| 2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material | Yes, well handled and thoughtful approach. |
| 3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation | |
| 4. Play and recreation areas | Minimal but useful rear yard |
| 5. Hard landscaping | Appropriate |
| 6. Parking and driveways | Appropriate |

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00070.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

- b) ZON PL190 / DP PL191 – 2326 Oak Bay Avenue
Zoning Amendment and Development Permit to permit a multifamily residential development.

K. Colpman, owner, and P. Johannknecht, architect, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Propose to replace the single family home with a 4 storey 14 unit condominium.
- Close proximity to the village with a high walk score, will be a LEED certified building.
- Application was put on hold until OCP was adopted, OCP identifies the lot as multifamily residential and recognizes that we need more housing stock to meet future growth, that we need housing diversity, and that we have limited options to downsize.
- One level underground parking with 18 stalls, electric car charging stations, stormwater retention tank; sidewalk widening and new curb extension off the sidewalk, and a bench on the front sidewalk are offered as community amenities.
- Building was reduced to a FAR of 1.8 by deleting the top northwest unit, which also gave the northern neighbour more light exposure.
- The neighbouring Garry oak tree roots cross the property line and are close to the sidewalk and the oak canopy is growing toward the subject property.
- Proposing a Copper beach replacement tree if the Garry oak cannot be preserved, with a \$25,000 financial contribution to the owners of the tree and a \$10,000 contribution to the Oak Bay urban forest program.
- Report from Gye and Associates indicates tree roots are in the proposed parkade area, which would potentially eliminate half of the parkade, and the tree cannot be maintained in the long term.

Panel Comments

Panel members asked for further information on the Garry oak tree, and noted the site may or may not be buildable for retention of the tree.

K. Colpman, owner, advised the neighbours have been consulted and that the tree would still be impacted and may not survive even if parking stalls were eliminated; and suggested a replacement tree provides a long term solution as it would adapt to new conditions. She also commented that eliminating all underground parking would upset other residents due to parking concerns.

P. Johannknecht, architect, suggested a replacement tree could be planted in a location outside of land that is suitable for new development, such as a boulevard; and that even a new single family home pushed to the furthest part of the site would compromise the tree.

D. Jensen noted the municipal arborist has determined there could be some modifications to the building that would help save the tree.

J. Gye, arborist, commented that if parking spaces were deleted, then the tree could possibly survive, and noted the tree is approximately 120 – 150 years old and its roots are shallow. However, after two separate tree investigations, he concluded the tree could not be preserved in a viable condition long term, and a Copper beach replacement tree would live approximately 100 -150 years. He also suggested space should be found to plant

large canopied trees that will not be affected by density and expressed concern over planting large boulevard tree along busy corridors.

B. Windjack, landscape architect, commented that the emphasis would be on creating a nice streetscape through the use of permeable pavers, sidewalk widening, sidewalk bench, large planters, natural plantings, a water feature, and 11 new trees.

Panel members commented that trees should not be moved on to public space for the community to maintain, and densification should not push the responsibility of green space onto the public.

Panel members advised the project achieves many of the OCP objectives and is a good building on a constrained site, noting the practicality of achieving a level of urban development with the potential of reducing some parking to save the Garry oak tree.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

1. Maintenance of park setting	Existing streetscape respected and complimented by this design.
2. Setbacks	Appropriate- in general conformance with those along Oak Bay Ave.
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Appropriate – a good fit
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Good, well handled
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Good, well handled
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	Some overshadowing of adjacent property to north but acceptable.
7. Overlook and privacy issues	Respectful of adjacent properties in what is an urban context.
8. Transition between private and public space	Excellent
9. Accessory buildings	N/A

Design of Buildings

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

Landscaping

1. Fencing and screening	Appropriate for urban context
2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	Neighbouring property Garry oak is challenging but new replacement trees are appropriate tradeoff.
3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	Well designed
4. Play and recreation areas	Not applicable at grade but rooftop garden/patio amenity welcome.
5. Hard landscaping	Well designed
6. Parking and driveways	Well designed

It was moved and seconded that Council approve ZON PL 190 /DP PL 191.

The motion was carried.

J. Armitage opposed.

- c) OCP000003 / ZON00027 / DP000016 – 1529 Monterey Avenue, 2260 / 2272 Oak Bay Ave
 Official Community Plan Amendment / Zoning Amendment / Development Permit
 To permit a multifamily residential development.
 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

D. Chard, applicant, P. Merrick and S. McIntyre, architects, gave a preliminary presentation of the proposed development. Some of the comments were:

- Proposal is for a 3 storey, 11 unit residential building with below grade parking.
- Proposing to consolidate two existing lots to allow for the residential and commercial properties to share a below grade parking structure accessed off Monterey Avenue, that will include a staircase and elevator access. There will be 26 parking stalls with 15 commercial spaces, 11 residential spaces, and one loading space.
- Infill housing is village related, supports OCP objectives, retains restaurant and gallery.
- Seeking to build within an already established village core, capitalizing on land that was predominantly used for parking, at a 0.86 floor area ratio.
- Site can support a higher mixed use density while maintaining the residential character of the neighbourhood.
- The target market is for residents looking to downsize, who still want to live in the community, age in place with barrier free access, and encourage alternative means of transportation including bicycles, transit and pedestrian travel near the village.
- Building materials are well suited for the existing neighborhood palette with exterior finishes including brick up the first floor with shingle above with board work casings, standing seam metal roofs, divided light windows and doors, and varied pitched roofs and dormers.
- One storey ground floor units have private space outdoor space in front and back, and two storey units above the ground floor units have elevator access.
- 9 of the 11 units will have the master bedroom on the main living level.
- Grade level units will have patio pavers and possible ramp access
- Landscape plan includes planting in berm soil areas or pots, and garden ornamental trees would be in large pots not planters.

Panel Comments

Panel members inquired about setbacks to the neighbour to the north and east, and about reducing parkade driveway access width along Monterey Avenue.

P. Merrick, architect, suggested the requested setbacks are supportable as they allow for cross ventilation and for morning and evening sun. He also noted proposed widths are to allow for commercial and residential parking to work cohesively, advising:

- Security gate inside parkade for resident parking, parkade is bright and well lit.
- Biggest challenge is to satisfy commercial loading needs for Ottavios.

Panel members suggested the parking area include a combined public domain with the service access, which could lead to a more vibrant community square near the commercial area; and that the parking ramp be narrowed to 20 feet, with a cut along the adjacent stairs to scooters and bicycles can be wheeled up from Monterey Avenue. Panel members also commented that the north side of the site is in danger of being leftover space, and the transition needs further study.

P. Merrick, architect, commented that the north side was a trade off in interest of all other benefits, but it could provide secondary access for gardening as well as provide light.

Panel members indicated general support for the proposed materials, but suggested reconsideration of their placement along the exterior so it does not overwhelm the building.

D. Chard, applicant, indicated concern regarding driveway narrowing, as it may further deter use of the parkade, particularly for commercial use. He also noted that they propose to widen the sidewalk along Oak Bay Avenue.

d) 2017 Allan Cassidy Awards

G. Buffett gave an introduction of the Allan Cassidy awards. Some of the comments were:

- Recognize new buildings and notable renovations or restorations that enhance the streetscape or neighbourhood. Projects to be considered would be completed from 2013 to 2016, which allows for new landscaping to mature.
- Up to 4 awards may be presented, which may be appropriate for the time period under consideration.
- Could consider expanding the awards to also look at environmental projects or architectural design.
- Could consider expanding the program to allow for community nominations.

Panel members suggested that if public nominations were sought, it would have to be a simple process to encourage participation, and would need further consideration as to how nominations were submitted and how they were considered.

Panel members requested District staff generate a list of new buildings and significant renovations undertaken since 2012 for further consideration.

6. Information Items

7. Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Tuesday, July 4, 2017.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:25 pm.