



MINUTES
OAK BAY HERITAGE COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JULY 09, 2019 AT 5:00 PM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS MUNICIPAL HALL, 2167 OAK BAY AVENUE

MEMBERS PRESENT

Marion Cumming
Jane Hall
Joan Heagle
Susan Ross

Cora Smith
Bronwyn Taylor
Robert Taylor
Pat Wilson
Councillor Esther Paterson

MEMBERS ABSENT

STAFF PRESENT

Deborah Jensen, Manager of Planning
Graeme Buffett, Planner
Krista Mitchell, Building / Planning Clerk

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5: 04 pm.

2. Adoption of Minutes

It was moved and seconded that the minutes from May 14, 2019 be adopted.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items

The agenda was approved as amended with the addition of items 4(b), 4(c) and 4(d).

4. Old Business

- a) HRA00005 – 1416 St David Street – Heritage Revitalization Agreement – Revision
To consider designating the home and allowing three suites within the building
(*Additional modifications proposed for window treatment.*)

R. Taylor recused himself from the meeting at 5:10 pm, citing conflict of interest.

G. Buffett gave a brief overview of the application. Some of the comments were:

- Commission members saw this application in October 2018, to convert a legal nonconforming duplex to a triplex and restore the building's exterior.
- The Dutch Colonial style building was built in 1911, with character defining features such as the pronounced gambrel roof with bell cast eaves and Palladian and oriel windows, as well as stained-glass window panes.
- The applicant has determined the leaded windows are not original, the heritage consultant notes the original windows were wood framed with leaded muntins.
- Application has been brought back to Commission to consider revisions as per the original style windows, and to present a reduction to 25% for the front yard paved surface.

R Collins, applicant, and J. Dam, heritage consultant, gave a summary of the application. Some of the comments were:

- Applicant will reproduce the original windows, instead of using the windows that are in place now, with Vintage Woodworks producing new double glazed windows.
- New double hung windows throughout the house will match the original window style.
- The site plan has been modified by eliminating the circular driveway and accommodating a total of four parking stalls, with two located on the north side of the site to service the upper suites.
- Proposing a metal roof with a flat finish, which is not uncommon on heritage buildings.

Commission Comments

Commission members noted that the statement of significance should be amended so it does not reference quarrelled window panes.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve the proposed revisions for HRA00005.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

R. Taylor returned to the meeting.

b) 2031 Runnymede Avenue.

D. Jensen, gave an update to the HRA application. Some of the comments were:

- Heritage Commission recommended Council approve HRA00002, for a two lot subdivision, and HAP00006, for renovations to the heritage home, in July 2016.
- The September 2018 public hearing was recessed to receive additional information. The applicant subsequently revised the proposal to reduce the number of proposed variances, and to not construct the detached garage, which was considered by Council on July 8 and a public hearing scheduled for September 9, 2019.
- Council requested the current status of the application be forwarded to the Heritage Commission for their information.
- The old carport has been removed, the statement of significance remains as presented, and now variances are requested for the proposed home on the north lot.

Commission Comments

Commission members noted the land is designated, and questioned how the new home style will fit into the streetscape.

G. Buffett advised that a new home on the proposed lot would be subject to a 0.4 floor area ratio, resulting in an estimated maximum 5100 ft² home with a 3800 ft² footprint.

Commission members noted the revised application is a dramatic change from the original proposal and Council should have referred the application back to the Commission. It was noted the home is an important historical house, it was a difficult decision in 2016 to recommend the subdivision, and not having plans of the new home is difficult.

D Jensen noted that a no subdivision clause does not ultimately protect a site as a request can be made to Council to remove such a condition, and clarified that Council directed staff to bring back the amended application to the Commission for information. She also noted the property is subject to the designation bylaw, and future development would be subject to a heritage alteration permit and a covenant for siting and design.

E. Patterson clarified that Council referred the application back to the Commission for information only, not for referral, noting that some Commission members would not be familiar with the application.

D. Jensen advised that, procedurally, the Commission has already provided a recommendation on this application and Council has not requested a follow up recommendation, noting the application proceeds to a public hearing on September 9th.

c) 1561 York Place

D. Jensen advised the applicant has advised they will not be continuing with the heritage revitalization agreement application, and that they have an approved building permit and driveway access permit for a single family home.

d) 960 Foul Bay Road

D. Jensen advised there is no update for this application.

5. New Business

a) HRA00009 – 785 Island Road – Heritage Revitalization Agreement
To consider designating the home and facilitating a two lot subdivision.

G. Buffett, gave a brief description of the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- The proposal includes two lots fronting on Island Road and Plumer Street, and the proposal for a lot line adjustment creates two lots of similar size.
- Home was built in 1912 and occupied by architect KB Spurgin.
- Exterior features include the front roof gable clad with half timber divided stucco, the second storey finished in board and batten planks above the horizontal bevel siding, wood framed windows, and the original front door with six crown glass bullseye lites.
- Proposal would remove the unsympathetic addition at the rear of the home, add a new addition in keeping with the style of the original home, and add a detached garage.

Commission Comments

Commission members noted there are two distinct aspects to this proposal, the house and the streetscape. They stated the house is viewed positively, with the demolition and small addition at the rear of the home that is more sympathetic and matching the home, and with the proposed garage in similar detail to the home. Commission members also noted a second home on Plumer Street may impact the rural feel and streetscape, and inquired whether a covenant could be used for siting and design.

G. Buffett advised the applicant and staff are still reviewing whether any interior features should be included in the statement of significance, noting that a designation bylaw could include interior features.

D. Yamamoto, applicant, provided additional information for the application. Some of the comments were:

- The proposed garage blends into the home with gable end styling.
- Preserving exterior character with minor changes, interior features not determined.
- Have received report from the neighbours, with the northerly neighbour expressing concern about garage placement and impact to trees.
- Two trees on the Plumer lot may be removed with two replacement trees planted, with canopy coverage for both lots being met.

Commission members inquired about an established garden on the proposed second lot; and stated that designating the home is a positive, that there is little concern over adjusting lot lines as the lots will be similar to other neighbouring lots, and that the public interest is the exterior of the home and the streetscape. Commission members also advised that the protection of the rural aspect of Plumer Street is the primary concern.

D. Yamamoto, applicant, advised he was unaware of an established garden.

G. Buffett clarified that to date, there are no confirmed building envelopes or design plans for buildings, and the current site plans could be simplified by removing potential building envelopes; and advised the District arborist reviews and reports on any proposed development.

D. Jensen clarified that subdivision approving officers are bound by legislation and how a subdivision can be reviewed, noting there is little flexibility in modifying regulations. She also noted that the streetscape is a road right of way, so as a subdivision works would be required in the roadway, and consideration could be given to a siting and design covenant.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve HRA00009, with the proviso that everything possible is done to protect the rural character and streetscape of Plumer Street, and the new house be sympathetic to 785 Island Road.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

D. Jensen clarified that applicants have the ability to sign a voluntary waiver to release interior floor plans and photos to the committees and Council, which then become public, however they are under no obligation to do this given privacy issues.

b) Committee Review Process

Council directed review of committees and commissions.

The Heritage Commission participated in a general discussion regarding the review of committees and commissions.

The Chair introduced consultant Sonia Santarossa, who has been hired by the District of Oak Bay to conduct a review of Council committees and commissions. Ms Santarossa facilitated a discussion with the Heritage members regarding their understanding of the role of the Heritage Commission and what they felt may be working well or where improvements could be made. The Heritage Commission was advised that Ms Santarossa expected to provide a report to a future Committee of the Whole meeting, possibly in September.

6. Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of the Heritage Commission is scheduled for Tuesday, September 10, 2019 in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 pm.