



**MINUTES**  
**OAK BAY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL**  
**TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 2019 AT 8:45 AM**  
**DOWNSTAIRS MEETING ROOM, MUNICIPAL HALL, 2167 OAK BAY AVENUE**

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

John Armitage  
Kim Milburn  
Dominique Yu

David Wilkinson  
Councillor Cairine Green

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Will King

**STAFF PRESENT**

Deborah Jensen, Manager of Planning  
Graeme Buffett, Planner  
Christine Currie, Building & Planning Clerk

**1. Call to Order**

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

**2. Adoption of Minutes from July 2, 2019**

It was moved and seconded that the minutes from July 2, 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 September 3, 2019 be approved.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

**4. Old Business**

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

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

- Panel previously considered the application at their April 30<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- Suggestions of the Panel have been incorporated including reduced size of deck that eliminates two variances, garage roof modified to a hip roof, and deck expansion guard rails now white, remaining variance accommodates the garage expansion.
- Existing porte cochere makes maneuverability challenging.

A. Bissen and owner, L. Saklas presented the application. Some of the comments were:

- Several suggestions from the Panel were implemented but detached garage suggestion is not feasible so garage layout remains as originally proposed.
- Soffit material and open rafter tails will match existing house with 1x4 tongue and groove, deck soffits will be a composite material to mimic tongue and groove, and garage rafters will match open rafters on main building.
- Proposed garage hip roof to eliminate ongoing maintenance from neighbouring laurel hedge, mature landscaping and existing trees will be retained.
- Deck railing will be welded aluminum, fascia and railing colours will blend.

## Panel Comments

Panel comments included the following:

- Building Code requires non-combustible material for the garage due to its proximity to the neighbouring lot line to minimize fire risk.
- Consider how fire wall intersects with roof line of garage.
- Confirmed exterior lighting is pointed downward and adheres to dark sky principles.
- Flat roof over the garage is more supportable as hip roof does not fit into Edwardian style of house, existing flat roof is submissive to the house where hip roof competes.
- Consider retaining existing garage and construct separate ancillary building with a breezeway or beside it in a more appropriately accessed location, for example within existing concrete area by retaining wall; current proposal conflicts with the house.
- Additions to the garage increase visibility from the street.
- Consider alternate materials for the deck railing such as fiberglass or wood.
- Deck proposal is confusing; encroaches on tennis court in an unfortunate way.
- Consider a straight sided deck parallel to the tennis court to exploit central viewing area of deck outside of the family room; use a calmer, simpler approach that leads with different geometry than the house; deal with posts in a more substantial way and visually tie it back to the house.
- Simplify deck and garage, work backwards from what results should be.
- Existing garage already crowds the porte cochere; keep carriage house under control.
- Review the deck as one composition, consider using one key stair instead of multiple.
- Reconsider flat roof solution overtop the garage, similar to existing or borrowing detailing from porte cochere, build parapet up.
- Further articulate the area beneath the deck; add corner piece.

In summary, the Panel members noted the following:

- Reconsider form, roof and detail of expanded portion of the garage such that the garage remains secondary to the main building, for example, flat roof.
- Reconsider deck composition, add corner piece to legs, further ground and articulate the area beneath the deck, provide railing details.
- Consider firewalls at the property line and on building faces starting at zero clearance.

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

The motion was carried.  
None opposed.

## 5. New Business

- a) ADP00113 – 642 Beach Drive
- b) ADP00114 – 640 Beach Drive

To facilitate construction of two single family homes.

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

- Applications resulting from a heritage revitalization agreement and four lot subdivision.
- Lots are regulated by an architectural siting and design covenant given their proximity to the Boyd residence and tree covenant for a garry oak grove on north side.
- Design provides a bridge between nearby heritage and newer homes through form and wood cladding.

M. Vos, applicant, M. Simcic, architect, T. Bonnemaïson, landscape architect, and A. Cooper, applicant, presented the application. Some of the comments were:

- Design intended to fit into diverse neighbourhood consisting of heritage and newer homes taking full advantage of view corridors, light conditions, exposure and topography while preserving the natural setting.
- Design cues taken from surrounding area yet proposed building has its own logic, design addresses heritage home yet has modern expression.
- Style employs simple rectilinear volumes with punched window openings and a unifying exterior finish while maintaining the heritage house as the focus.
- Goal of the heritage revitalization agreement is to make the heritage home a prominent feature on Beach Drive; the new homes are designed to bridge the craft from the heritage homes without mimicking heritage.
- Board and batten detailing provides vertical depth; material is further refined at entry points; form is stepped in places; both homes have good southern exposure.
- Window system is a darker aluminum frame set back with a thinner, subtle line, with an inner frame that articulates the edge; deeper profile of windows provides a secondary framing to them; house colour done in monochrome, lighter tonality.
- Site has rocky outcrops, covenanted Garry oak meadow, ocean views; landscape design includes native plantings acting as a buffer to the naturalized areas, formal plantings blended into landscape; adding evergreen trees and shrubs enhances ocean views while providing privacy between properties.

### Panel Comments

Panel comments included the following:

- Consider installing micro or drip irrigation into the naturalized oak area.
- Well done design; layering forms is respectful, board and batten detailing is intriguing and distinctive, execution of craftsmanship and quality will be in the details.
- Could add usable space on the roof, and adding a pop of primary colour, for example, soffit or door.
- Ensure window sills are properly addressed to either amplify the component or discreetly flash them.
- Use of hardi panel is adequate provided the exterior studs remain and proper joints are employed; also consider utilizing more weather resistant materials such as zinc.
- Concern with privacy and overlook issues as outdoor entertainment terrace at 640 Beach Drive is in close proximity to neighbour's master bedroom.
- Reconsider the amount of paved surface and use of blacktop due to climate change; consider shared driveway access, eliminate pedestrian pathways, retain terracing in both directions; use higher quality material surface material; improve fenced median between properties or consider removing fencing.

In summary, the Panel members noted the following:

- Reconsider the amount of paved surface, use higher quality surface material, and utilize maintenance free materials.
- Consider potential privacy and overlook issues between the outdoor entertainment terrace at 640 Beach Drive and master bedroom of neighbouring property.

<b>Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist – 642 Beach Drive</b>		
<b>Siting of Buildings</b>		
1.	Maintenance of residential park setting	Excellent handling of terrain, context and privacy.
2.	Setbacks	No issues.
3.	Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Strong reinforcement of intent of heritage agreement.
4.	Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Contributes to envisioned development.
5.	Relationship to adjacent buildings	Carefully considered (note that 640 has a potential privacy conflict with adjacent existing home on Inglewood Terrace).
6.	Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	None.
7.	Overlook and privacy issues	Nothing of consequence.
8.	Transition between private and public space	Excellent.
9.	Accessory buildings	n/a.
<b>Design of Buildings</b>		
1.	General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Entirely appropriate for context, terrain and heritage focal point.
2.	Roofscape	Well handled.
3.	Flashing	No issues, all will need to be well considered given the façade system.
4.	Lighting	No issues.
5.	Garages and outbuildings	n/a.
<b>Landscaping</b>		
1.	Fencing and screening	Applicant can delete any fences not considered marketable.
2.	Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	Well done.
3.	Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	Appropriate treatment.
4.	Play and recreation areas	Fine.
5.	Hard landscaping	Applicant invited to consider reducing driveway impact by conjoining or leaving vegetative strips or both.
6.	Parking and driveways	Appealing.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that ADP000113 be approved.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

<b>Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist – 640 Beach Drive</b>	
<b>Siting of Buildings</b>	
1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Excellent handling of terrain, context and privacy.
2. Setbacks	No issues.
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Strong reinforcement of intent of Heritage agreement.
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Contributes to envisioned development.
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Carefully considered (note that 640 has a potential privacy conflict with adjacent existing home on Inglewood Terrace).
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	None.
7. Overlook and privacy issues	Nothing of consequence.
8. Transition between private and public space	Excellent.
9. Accessory buildings	n/a.
<b>Design of Buildings</b>	
1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Entirely appropriate for context, terrain and heritage focal point.
2. Roofscape	Well handled.
3. Flashing	No issues, all will need to be well considered given the façade system.
4. Lighting	No issues.
5. Garages and outbuildings	n/a.
<b>Landscaping</b>	
1. Fencing and screening	Applicant can delete any fences not considered marketable.
2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	Well done.
3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	Appropriate treatment.
4. Play and recreation areas	Fine.
5. Hard landscaping	Applicant invited to consider reducing driveway impact by conjoining or leaving vegetative strips or both.
6. Parking and driveways	Appealing.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that ADP000114 be approved.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

c) DP000027 – 1280 Newport Avenue

To facilitate exterior alterations to a multifamily residential building.

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

- Proposal is to replace existing weathered balcony guard rails with prefinished dark anodized aluminum with glass guards; upper units were previously updated and will not be altered.
- Works primarily affect street facing façade and will blend well with style of building; materials are consistent with character of building, setbacks are unchanged.

K. Hillel, applicant, and R. Pettinger, owner, presented the application. Some of the comments were:

- Proposing to replace weathered, rotting wood guard rails to improve safety and bring into building code compliance with respect to height and anchorage connections
- Removing painted wood caps and steel pickets and replacing them with dark bronze anodized aluminum glass guard and rail system in keeping with existing fourth and fifth floor balconies that were previously replaced.
- Rails to reflect building character and improve street appeal.

### Panel Comments

Panel comments included the following:

- Concern regarding how guard rails will be fastened; plate and pickets do not need to be same colour; pickets are differently detailed.
- Confirmed the glass panels are clear and identified that, where using glass panels, ensure to visually maintain the strong 4 to 6 inch horizontal line look and to keep them in same location as existing; focus on mounting glazing.
- Original building scheme includes substantial railing; should consider installing the new system in same location as original ones, or consider retaining existing railing and replace top piece and install a metal cap flashing overtop to encase the upper wood.
- Consider separate price of glass panels from welded aluminum / steel work, upper band material; steer away from using a kit.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that DP000027 be deferred to a subsequent meeting of the Advisory Design Panel.

The motion was carried.  
None opposed.

d) Prospect Heritage Conservation Area  
Introduction to the review process.

D. Jensen updated the Panel on the heritage conservation area review process, advising that the review has been completed and consultants have compiled a schedule of properties and set of design guidelines. She noted that the advisory committees will be providing recommendations regarding the heritage conservation area, and requested the Design Panel members review the guidelines in anticipation of the November meeting.

### 6. Information Items

None.

### 7. Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Tuesday, October 1, 2019.

### 8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 am.