



OAK BAY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL
TUESDAY, MARCH 5, 2019 AT 8:45 AM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MUNICIPAL HALL, 2167 OAK BAY AVENUE

MEMBERS PRESENT

John Armitage
Will King
Kim Milburn

Dominic Yu
Cairine Green

MEMBERS ABSENT

David Wilkinson

STAFF PRESENT

Deborah Jensen, Manager of Planning
Graeme Buffett, Planner

Christine Currie, Recording Secretary

1. Call to Order

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

2. Adoption of Minutes from February 5, 2019.

It was moved and seconded that the minutes from February 5, 2019 be adopted as amended.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items

It was moved and seconded that the agenda for March 5, 2019 be approved.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

4. Old Business

None.

5. New Business

- a) DVP00090/ADP00105 – 2970 Rutland Road
To permit an addition to a single family home.

G. Buffett provided an overview of the application. Some of the comments were:

- Application for siting and design approval for a 1913 home not on the heritage register.
- Proposal includes additions to both sides and rear of the existing house, variances are requested to increase permitted heights and relax setbacks; existing house does not meet these requirements.
- Property recently consolidated with 3140 Beach Drive for total lot area of 5670 m².
- Staff have identified concerns about the proposal, both for variances and for compliance with Uplands guidelines.
- Maximum height is determined by lot breadth, and the zoning for this property permits it to have a higher height.
- The existing porte-cochere satisfies the covered parking requirement.
- Panel should review the proposal in context of the Uplands guidelines.

R. Townsend, and K. Dewey, applicants, provided a brief summary of the proposal. Comments included:

- The house, *Mulberry*, named after the Island's oldest mulberry tree, located on the site.
- Home is one of the first built in the Uplands by the Uplands Company, designed by M.F. Rogers and built as a show home in 1913.
- Proposal will remove the garage and add a wing on either side of the house.
- Quality materials will be used, original windows will be reproduced, and lost features such as downspouts and flashing details will be reincorporated.
- Existing right of way running between the two lots limits the siting of the addition.
- Could construct a new house twice as large, but want to be authentic to the home.
- The front gate and hedges were installed less than five years ago.
- Rear side of house, facing Beach Drive, will be treated as a second "front", with the same level of design and curb appeal as a true front.
- Back lot will likely include an accessory building, garden shed and pool.
- Neighbours have been consulted and are in agreement with the proposal.

Panel Comments

Panel comments included the following:

- Confirmed that the porte-cochere, hard surfaces and front yard fencing are existing; that the existing building base material is stone; that masonry construction will be employed, and that proposed material will be true stone with flare detailing.
- Confirmed that colours and materials, including windows, will match the original and noted that leaded glass and thermal panes must meet Building Code.
- Questioned whether options were considered to lower height of building.
- Noted that privacy screening on the east side includes a large hedge, and that the house is set back farther than neighbouring houses, which also helps with privacy.
- One tree, located within the rear building footprint, will be removed.
- Confirmed concrete handrail spindles will be simple, square and tapered.
- Design is appropriate but building doesn't meet setbacks, encroachments not necessary.
- Variances may be supportable but encroachments could be minimized without detriment to the design, such as narrowing the projecting portion of the basement.
- Upper portion of the library will adversely affect the neighbouring property, should consider lessening the encroachment of the upper part by lowering the roof mass.
- Basement extension worsens setback encroachment and design does not require it, should reduce basement size and maintain a 3.12 m setback across the north lot line.
- C. Green reinforced that staff reports are an integral part of council decision making.

D. Jensen noted the Panel could focus their discussion on the Uplands design guidelines.

The Design Panel provided additional comments with respect to the design guidelines:

- House massing is lessened by front gates and hedging; design is consistent and complements the view corridor through the rear yard; parklike setting is respected.
- Scale and rhythm is improved, is set back from the street so it does not overwhelm.
- Addition creates overlook and privacy issues on north side; proposal needs a wider lot to accommodate design, site limitations could prevent design from moving forward.
- Design is superbly executed and is worthy to be forwarded to Council; however, the site does not accommodate the design.
- Proposal is designed to maintain the heritage of the building, and is worth maintaining.

In summary, the Panel members noted the following:

- Maintain a 3.12 metre setback across the north property line including the second floor to minimize the encroachment to the side yard setback.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist	
Siting of Buildings	
1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Park like setting is not adversely affected by proposed design.
2. Setbacks	Basement expansion to conform to existing 3.12 metre setback. Library expansion expands existing non-conformance but is supportable by consistency of overall design.
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Enlarged house presence is appropriate to size and prominence of lot. Height variances are supportable.
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Reinforces spatial axis down Lansdowne Road and out to the ocean, without being overwhelming.
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Only affects neighbour to north where rear yard may feel the presence of new library upper floor.
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	Possible shadowing on north side neighbour in winter. No sun studies presented.
7. Overlook and privacy issues	See 5 above. No view windows proposed on north side, only stained glass.
8. Transition between private and public space	Existing entry strengthened. New rear "front" will be created to enhance view from Beach Drive.
9. Accessory buildings	Existing removed. No new proposed at this stage. Future accessory buildings on lower lot should respect Item 8.
Design of Buildings	
1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Comments above. Design is well handled.
2. Roofscape	Proposal is well considered with high quality materials.
3. Flashing	Copper – high quality.
4. Lighting	Appears subdued – must conform to Dark Sky principles as well as following precedent of original.
5. Garages and outbuildings	None.
Landscaping	
1. Fencing and screening	No changes proposed. Front hedge and gates are acceptable to ameliorate imposing nature of house front and support item 8.
2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	One significant tree removed. Replacement not required by bylaw but should be provided under canopy program.
3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	See above. Future landscape to be developed, which was acceptable approach in context of this application.
4. Play and recreation areas	Rear terrace integrated with house extension. Future development in lower lot to be separate application.
5. Hard landscaping	See 4 above. Raised lawn as device for view and spatial manipulation to be further developed and appears very promising.
6. Parking and driveways	Minimal.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that DVP00090/ADP00105 be approved.

The motion was carried. One member opposed.

6. Information Items

None.

7. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Tuesday, April 2, 2019.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 am.