



OAK BAY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL
TUESDAY, APRIL 30, 2019 AT 8:45 AM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MUNICIPAL HALL, 2167 OAK BAY AVENUE

MEMBERS PRESENT

John Armitage
Will King

David Wilkinson
Dominic Yu

MEMBERS ABSENT

Cairine Green
Kim Milburn

STAFF PRESENT

Bruce Anderson, Director of Building and 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 March 5, 2019.

It was moved and seconded that the minutes from March 5, 2019 be adopted.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items

It was moved and seconded that the agenda for April 30, 2019 be approved.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

4. Old Business

None.

5. New Business

- a) ADP00103 / DVP00087 – 3125 Weald Road
To permit renovations to a single family home.

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

- Proposed work includes building a new deck, and rebuilding and extending the garage similar to the existing footprint.
- Variances are requested to relax the front, interior side and total side lot line setbacks as both the garage and rear deck encroach into the setbacks.
- Existing garage is difficult to access due to the porte cochere siting.
- Siting of existing house has created a situation where one of the proposed decks located at the rear of the property encroaches into the front setback.
- Proposal follows OCP policy of maintaining existing siting and of fostering new buildings within existing footprint.
- Concerns were relayed to applicant about inconsistent roof design between the house and proposed garage, and the applicant has elected to continue with the peaked roof design for the garage.

A. Bisson, applicant, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- New deck in rear yard will replace the existing, and the garage will be expanded to provide more functional space and storage, utilizing a preferred gable roof.
- An attached garage is preferred as it is more cost effective to reuse the existing building and footprint and does not disturb any trees.
- Client driven design includes gable roof, deck railings and guards.

Panel Comments

Panel comments included the following:

- Consider an alternate location for the garage if current location is not adequate.
- Stricter code requirements must be met for extending the garage closer to the lot line.
- Garage treatment is incompatible with house style; suggest submissive style where garage is subservient to house and has a relationship with the retained porte cochere.
- Consider maintaining existing flat roofline, continue with a neutral design.
- Be mindful of dark sky principles, ensure lighting is angled downward.
- Consider reducing proposed deck size to avoid requiring a variance.
- Confirmed aluminum soffit treatment will be installed underneath the deck.
- West elevation is visible from the street and is an important piece of the composition; design should be appropriate for such visibility.
- Consider retaining the existing garage and construct a single detached garage at the front corner of the property.

In summary, the Panel members noted the following:

- Utilize a calm, consistent design that complements the existing house.
- Consider a less competing, more simplistic style compatible to the house design.
- Explore deck railing details that enhance house symmetry (white railings, not glass).

It was moved and seconded to recommend that ADP00103/ DVP00087 be tabled to a subsequent meeting of the Advisory Design Panel.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

- b) ADP00106 – 3033 Devon Road
To permit construction of a single family home.

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

- Proposing a traditional design home utilizing stucco cladding with open gables and a covered entryway; second storey will be stepped back from the street.
- New home will replace a single storey house with similar front setback; side setbacks will increase; house will be built further back than existing.
- Most existing homes on street are single storey homes.

Lindsay Baker, applicant, and David Guan, owner, presented the application. Some of the comments were:

- Proposing a French contemporary style meeting Step 3 of the BC Energy Step Code.
- Larger setback allows additional trees to be planted for a parklike setting.
- Side yard setback proposed at 6 metres; setbacks are not maximized.
- Proposed sloping hip roof permits stepping back the upper floor to minimize massing and avoid shading the neighbouring properties.

Panel Comments

Panel comments included the following:

- Confirmed no fencing proposed for front of the property.
- Plans do not specify stucco for wall type details.
- Be mindful of dark sky principles, ensure lighting is angled downward.
- Applaud the targeted extra energy performance.
- Consider the treatment of the top of the foundation wall; treat it in a deliberate way.
- Suggest reducing driveway width at boulevard then flare out on private property.
- Create visual connection to front door from the yard (ie. stepping stone pathway plantings).
- Windows will be set in and wrapped in stucco; consider detailing around windows.
- Express more horizontality for further articulation and development of the massing to better fit into the neighbourhood.
- Streetscape elevation is most important; emphasize front entryway, look for cohesion from surrounding properties, pay attention to simple details and quality design.
- Simplify rooflines, consider hip roofs throughout, de-emphasize garage height, lower the gable overtop the second floor, consider soffit details.
- Add planting to both sides of entryway, blend landscape into existing neighbourhood.
- Avoid awkward bump out (closet) that affects the front building face.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that ADP00106 be tabled to a subsequent meeting of the Advisory Design Panel.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

c) ADP00107 – 2785 Dorset Road

To permit renovations to the front elevation of a single family home.

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

- Previous application was approved by Council September 2018, work is underway.
- Challenged with a front entry element, particularly water run-off and moisture issues; would like to revert to the original design with no gable over the entry.
- Primary change is a sloped, covered entryway.

M. Ludwig, and B. Kurylo, applicant, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Proposal is to revert to original arched timber detail; gable entry is mechanically awkward space where water and vermin issues could be problematic.
- Clients appreciate the entryway and space it provides, and how it ties into the new living room roof and follows the slope of the existing gable.
- Applicant wants to incorporate a broader belly band to break up the east elevation.

Panel Comments

Panel comments included the following:

- Projection of approximately 3 feet is adequate, belly band is unnecessary element.
- Consider alternative skylight over front entry to avoid 'plastic bubble' appearance, with double smaller skylights preferable.
- Panel reiterated its July 2018 suggestion that the two posts from the existing landing be moved forward; create a suitable pitched roof as an extension of the existing plane.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist		
Siting of Buildings		
1.	Maintenance of residential park setting	ok
2.	Setbacks	ok
3.	Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	ok
4.	Impact on scale and rhythm of development	ok
5.	Relationship to adjacent buildings	ok
6.	Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	ok
7.	Overlook and privacy issues	ok
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	ok
2.	Roofscape	ok
3.	Flashing	ok
4.	Lighting	ok
5.	Garages and outbuildings	n/a
Landscaping		
1.	Fencing and screening	ok
2.	Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	ok
3.	Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	ok
4.	Play and recreation areas	ok
5.	Hard landscaping	ok
6.	Parking and driveways	ok

It was moved and seconded to recommend that ADP00107 be approved.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

d) ADP00109 / DVP00092 – 2725 Lincoln Road

To permit renovations to the front and rear elevation of a single family home.

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

- Proposal includes construction of a rear deck, changes to window, door and garage openings, and front entryway.
- Proposed deck provides direct access to the rear yard from the main living area and replaces an existing paved area.
- A variance is requested to reduce the required separation between the new deck and an existing in ground swimming pool located at the rear of the property.

D. Makaroff, applicant, and B. Hougaard, owner, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- New energy efficient windows will replace existing single pane windows.
- Deck is less than 3.0 metres from the edge of the pool, which needs a variance.

Panel Comments

Panel comments included the following:

- Muntin bars are an unnecessary window element and can be deleted.
- Consider a larger deck design to include a sitting area.
- Garage door detailing is interesting.
- Be mindful of dark sky principles, ensure lighting is angled downward in soffits.

- Confirmed that the stucco will be repaired, patched and repainted after new windows are installed; existing visual details around windows will be maintained and matched.
- Confirmed that the front entry is fully concrete and consistent with the housing style.
- Variance request is reasonable.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist	
Siting of Buildings	
1. Maintenance of residential park setting	No issues
2. Setbacks	No issues
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Retained. Unchanged.
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	None.
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	n/a
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	n/a
7. Overlook and privacy issues	None noted.
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	Unchanged.
2. Roofscape	Unchanged.
3. Flashing	n/a
4. Lighting	Dark sky principles please
5. Garages and outbuildings	Unaltered.
Landscaping	
1. Fencing and screening	No change.
2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	Well managed.
3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	Unaltered.
4. Play and recreation areas	Unaltered.
5. Hard landscaping	Unaltered.
6. Parking and driveways	Unaltered.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that ADP00102 / DVP00092 be approved.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

e) ADP00111 – 3565 Upper Terrace Road

To permit renovations to the rear elevation of a single family home.

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

- Proposal is for a deck addition on the east side of the home, where deck is set back significantly from the street and consistent with main floor height.
- Deck is sited on the Midland Road elevation, existing trees are not impacted.
- Materials include glass guards with aluminum railings and vinyl decking.

L. Kors, applicant, presented the application. Some of the comments were:

- Proposed deck is an extension of the existing deck, colours and materials will match the existing condition.
- Existing front decks are small and unusable, the sloping rear yard does not provide usable yard space; deck provides direct access from the yard to the main floor.
- Rear siting will minimize visual impact on streetscape; extension is well below existing roofline, which also mitigates impact on neighbouring properties.
- Two new large canopy trees will be added to the property.

Panel Comments

Panel comments included the following:

- Adhere to Dark Sky principles for any exterior lighting.
- Ensure soffits beneath deck are finished to match the existing deck.
- Consider cutting light wells or skylights into the deck to permit additional light into the windows below, or create a connection or a step down from the deck to the lower area to permit additional lighting into the house below.
- Consider a stronger cap rail be installed onto the new portion of the deck.
- Railings should be consistent with those adjacent to them.

In summary, the Panel members suggested the following:

- Ensure soffits beneath deck are finished.
- Be mindful of dark sky principles, ensure lighting is angled downward.
- Materials to be consistent throughout.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist		
Siting of Buildings		
1.	Maintenance of residential park setting	Ok.
2.	Setbacks	No variance.
3.	Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Appropriate.
4.	Impact on scale and rhythm of development	None.
5.	Relationship to adjacent buildings	None.
6.	Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	None.
7.	Overlook and privacy issues	None.
8.	Transition between private and public space	None.
9.	Accessory buildings	n/a
Design of Buildings		
1.	General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Strong effect of projecting deck when viewed from below.
2.	Roofscape	Soffit treatment to underside of.
3.	Flashing	Wrap vinyl deck onto fascia.
4.	Lighting	n/a
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	n/a
6.	Parking and driveways	n/a

It was moved and seconded to recommend that ADP00111 be approved.

The motion was approved.
None opposed.

f) DP000026 – 1476 Beach Drive

To permit replacement of balcony railings on a multifamily residential building.

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

- Exterior alterations proposed for existing building, update will affect street elevation.
- Proposed work updates the exterior balcony by replacing corroded wrought iron railing with glass guards and aluminum posts and caps; end walls will match and blend with the exterior side elevations and existing building.

R. Egli and B. Mursell, applicants, presented the application. Some of the comments were:

- Railing height of existing balcony guards are nonconforming and need replacing.
- Propose simple design to best suit the building.
- Framed custom welded aluminum sections with pony walls on the ends.
- Railing will be custom made; intent is not to cheapen the building.

Panel Comments

Panel comments included the following:

- Concerned with replacing something unique with something with less character.
- Not enough detailing for rails or end panels provided; proposal is underwhelming.
- Consider corner details (ie. metal corners for outside corners), solid looking design, soffit material, end screens are important.
- Consider a modular system.
- Angularity works with the end panels that run full height, providing a sense of enclosure, end walls should not be competing (not stucco).
- Express 16 inch returns as fins.
- Consider overlaying balustrades like the existing, break it up with posts in between, similar to the original rendering.
- Consider additional variation, proposal detracts and has no rhythm, refinement needed.
- Consider maintaining existing railing.
- Consider a hybrid fabrication that provides wind screen and appropriate height.
- Confirmed the vinyl decking will be replaced.

In summary, the Panel members suggested the following:

- Comprehensive, consistent railing system only.
- Delete end pony walls.
- Use full height posts at ends to accommodate full height screens where desired.
- Consider replacing clear glass with opaque or coloured glass, and incorporate perforated metal pickets.
- Must be a consistent organizing modular system.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that DP000026 be tabled to a subsequent meeting of the Advisory Design Panel.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

g) Committee Review Process – Advisory Design Panel

None.

6. Information Items

None.

7. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Tuesday, June 7, 2019.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm.