



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

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

John Armitage                            David Wilkinson  
Will King                                 Dominique Yu  
Kim Milburn                             Councillor Cairine Green

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

**STAFF PRESENT**

Bruce Anderson, Director of Building and Planning  
Deborah Jensen, Manager of Planning  
Graeme Buffett, Planner  
Christine Currie, Building & Planning Clerk

**1. Call to Order**

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

**2. Adoption of Minutes from September 3, 2019**

It was moved and seconded that the minutes from September 3, 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 November 5, 2019 be approved.

The motion was carried.  
None opposed.

**4. Old Business**

a) 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:

- Application was reviewed by the Advisory Design Panel at the September meeting.
- Proposal is limited to replacing existing weathered balcony guard rails for four of the eight units in the building.
- Plans were revised as per Panel comments by: more closely matching cap rail and bottom rail to existing rails; reducing number of vertical posts with wider glass panels attached with side mounted glazing clips; mounting guards to the balcony surface and not the exterior face.
- Materials include prefinished dark bronze anodized aluminum and glass, with materials consistent with the other previously altered guard rails.

**Panel Comments**

Panel comments advised that the balcony design is in keeping with design and character of the building.

<b>Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist</b>	
<b>Siting of Buildings</b>	
1. Maintenance of residential park setting	N/A
2. Setbacks	N/A
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	N/A
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Subtle changes to character of guards on unit balconies.
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	N/A
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	N/A
7. Overlook and privacy issues	N/A
8. Transition between private and public space	Slightly less screening effect between public and private, but no issues.
9. Accessory buildings	N/A
<b>Design of Buildings</b>	
1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Minor adjustment to details of guards on balconies.
2. Roofscape	No changes.
3. Flashing	Consistent with existing flashings.
4. Lighting	Consistent.
5. Garages and outbuildings	N/A
<b>Landscaping</b>	
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 DP000027 be approved.

The motion was carried.  
None opposed.

## 5. New Business

### a) DP000027 – 2187 Oak Bay Avenue

To facilitate exterior alterations to a commercial building.

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

- Proposing to renovate a second floor commercial unit by enclosing one second floor balcony at the northwest corner of the building with cladding details and window glazing patterns that are integrated with original design.
- No changes to parking requirements or setbacks, and no variances requested.
- Balcony has been used as storage space and does not contribute to the commercial function of the building.

G. Damant, applicant, and D. Mattrick, owner, presented the application. Some of the comments were:

- During design and layout of interior space, the existing corner triangular balcony space was found to negatively impact function of office space.
- Enclosure mimics window glazing pattern and cladding details of adjacent wall and will be fully integrated into the original design.
- Balcony is not part of the public space therefore the modification is appropriate.
- Confirmed that the elevation drawings contained the accurate fenestration plan.

## Panel Comments

Panel comments included the following:

- Noted that the elevation and photographic rendering do not match.
- Confirmed window material and finishes will be replicated.
- Rendering with three windows preferable over elevations showing two windows.
- Balconies are important aspect of urban design and all three corners benefit from them; consider treatment of enclosed balcony so it still reads as a balcony.
- Balcony provides dynamic appearance and provides visual interest.
- Satisfied with rendering; treatment is well suited to the building.
- Building could benefit from asymmetrical approach and lightening up.
- Design accentuates heaviness of cantilever corner.
- Consider an alternative asymmetrical approach by introducing fixed glazing panels below the belt line so the corner is still notable and different from existing building symmetry.

In summary, the Panel members noted the following:

- Elevation and renderings are inconsistent.
- Consider an asymmetrical approach by introducing fixed glazing panels below the belt line so the corner is still notable and different from existing symmetry.
- Allow for flexibility to modify proposal based on Panel comments, but overall Panel is satisfied with the proposed approach.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist	
<b>Siting of Buildings</b>	
1. Maintenance of residential park setting	N/A
2. Setbacks	N/A
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Subtle changes to visual impact.
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	A welcome new asymmetry. Proponent is encouraged to increase new glazing (below belt line).
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Slight.
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	Nil.
7. Overlook and privacy issues	Nil, except perhaps public's view 'up' into the expanded boardroom space.
8. Transition between private and public space	N/A
9. Accessory buildings	N/A
<b>Design of Buildings</b>	
1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	The panel felt scheme might be a bit too symmetrical.
2. Roofscape	No issues.
3. Flashing	No issues.
4. Lighting	No issues.
5. Garages and outbuildings	N/A
<b>Landscaping</b>	
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 DP000028 be approved.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

- b) Prospect Heritage Conservation Area  
Introduction to the review process.

Bruce Anderson joined the meeting at 9:19 am.

B. Anderson outlined the purpose of the Prospect Heritage Conservation Area (HCA), noting that the Conservation Area would be incorporated into Official Community Plan through a bylaw amendment, and that a heritage alteration permit process would be used to address proposed modifications to both scheduled and non-scheduled properties within the neighbourhood. He also explained that the proposed guidelines would be used to review proposed changes to both protected and non-protected properties, with the intent to ensure protection of existing heritage resources and compatibility of development of non-protected properties with heritage value and character of the area.

### **Panel Comments**

Panel comments included the following:

- Specificity of materials for non-scheduled buildings appears more than contextual to the neighbourhood and excludes modern architectural expressions, and good heritage renewal in an urban setting can exist; guidelines should be more general.
- Heritage connections can be enhanced by use of modern, high quality materials.
- Questioned how density increases fit with the heritage protection goals for the neighbourhood, as the area is an intelligent location for increased density.
- Modern expression is permitted but the heritage aspect of the neighbourhood must be maintained, as the heritage value is the area itself not just the homes, so authentic materials must be employed.
- Confirmed that Council will consider the HCA early next year, and questioned how heritage alteration permits will be reviewed and through which bodies, for example the Heritage Commission and the Advisory Design Panel.
- The heritage alteration permit process should be designed to avoid frustration and ensure quality of design and materials is adhered to, for example, Panel oversight.
- Need to acknowledge time and prominence of the area that predates the establishment of the neighbourhood as it exists today.
- Motivation for the HCA is to protect meaningful areas, not to exclude people or heritage conversions, could be unintended consequences if document is too prescriptive.
- Also need to consider other bylaws if preserving the heritage qualities of the neighbourhood, for example, the tree protection bylaw.

### **6. Information Items**

None.

### **7. Next Meeting**

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Tuesday, December 3, 2019.

**8. In Camera Resolution / Motion to Adjourn**

It was moved and seconded that in accordance with section 90(1)(b) of the *Community Charter*, the open portion of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel be adjourned and that a closed session be convened to discuss personal information about an identifiable individual who is being considered for a municipal award of honour, or who has offered to provide a gift to the municipality on condition of anonymity.

The motion was carried.  
None opposed.

The open portion of the meeting adjourned at 11:00 am.