



MINUTES
OAK BAY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 2020 AT 8:45 AM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MUNICIPAL HALL, 2167 OAK BAY AVENUE

MEMBERS PRESENT

Frans Compeer
Justin Gammon
Will King

MEMBERS ABSENT

Carl Peterson
Councillor Cairine Green

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 8:50 am.

2. Adoption of Minutes from February 4, 2020

It was moved and seconded that the minutes from February 4, 2020 be adopted.
The motion was carried.
None opposed.

3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items

It was moved and seconded that the agenda for September 1, 2020 be approved.
The motion was carried.
None opposed.

4. Old Business

None.

5. New Business

- a) ADP00120 – 3000 Valdez Place
To facilitate construction of a single-family home.

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

- Site located on Valdez Place cul-de-sac and borders on Uplands Park.
- Proposal to build a 2-storey home designed with cues from French baroque period; elements include field stone veneer, slate roofing and wood windows and doors.
- Proposed landscaping plan provides strong transition between private and public realms; several mature protected trees will be removed with replacement trees required.
- No variances are requested.

M. Dalton, and M. Finlay, architect presented the application. Some of the comments were:

- French style designed house; building and pool have been combined to mitigate impact on the mature trees on the site.
- This is a brand new “old” building using indigenous, subdued materials and high-quality products with the environment at the forefront.
- House settles into the landscape like it has always been there.

Panel Comments

- Confirmed sustainable measures and energy conservation will be incorporated into the home and best practices will be used for every element in the build.
- Confirmed authenticity of materials.
- Noted dark sky principles will be adhered to including discreet path lighting, no lighting planned for the park side of the home; only small, hooded lights will be used on rear of the building.
- Placement of detached garage mitigates potential impact on mature trees; but its siting could be considered as counter to the design or as a good bookend to the home with the indoor pool on the other side.
- Building size appears large for the lot, but it is provided additional breathing room with Uplands Parks located at the rear of the property.
- Confirmed several replacement trees will be planted to replace those being removed.
- Noted that some external equipment related to the geothermal heating may be sited on the property
- Challenge the owner to expand on sustainable measures.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist	
Siting of Buildings	
1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Yes
2. Setbacks	No variance
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Tremendous building in keeping with vision of area
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Large building, perhaps large for site, but within zoning regulations
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Okay
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	Okay
7. Overlook and privacy issues	None
8. Transition between private and public space	Well done landscaping
9. Accessory buildings	
Design of Buildings	
1. General massing, proportion, and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Well done
2. Roofscape	Well done
3. Flashing	Well done
4. Lighting	Low lighting with modest amount of landscaping wall light is appropriate
5. Garages and outbuildings	
Landscaping	
1. Fencing and screening	Well done
2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	Tree replacement is sufficient
3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	Good
4. Play and recreation areas	n/a
5. Hard landscaping	Well done
6. Parking and driveways	Well done

It was moved and seconded to recommend that ADP00120 be approved.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

- b) ADP00121 – 3060 Midland Road
To facilitate construction of a single-family home.

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

- Site located in south end of Uplands.
- Proposal for a two-storey single family with detached accessory building and in-ground swimming pool.
- Design cues taken from French Provincial manor house style; accessory building to correspond with principal building; elements include acrylic stucco cladding, brick veneer at the building base, aluminum clad wood windows.
- No variances requested.

K. Hillel, applicant presented the application. Some of the comments were:

- Owners were very prescriptive regards design and provided very clear intentions; French provincial manor style used as inspiration for symmetry, balance, hip roof; balance of function and fun.

Panel Comments

- Work rainwater leaders into design; confirmed rainwater leaders are in keeping with the flashing details and will be carefully planned for.
- The cornice and pilaster elements do not connect substantively, and refinement suggested.
- Consider consistency of spacing between the windows and soffits for both floors; confirmed desire for maximum height permitted for windows.
- Fenestrations on the north and south elevations appear less composed and do not relate to the other elevations; explore creating balance.
- Brackets under soffits and under-hangs appear disconnected distracting from overall composition.
- Consider additional energy efficiencies; confirmed heating and cooling of house will be well considered and designed but format of framework has yet to be decided.
- Consider incorporating second storey design element onto the second floor above the entry to break up the massing (i.e. balustrade); opportunity lost in the center of west and east elevations.
- Consider adding landscaping by the front entry to provide emphasis to the front façade.
- Refinement of details and materials consider durability and genuine materials; authenticity of materials is important; treatments such as the mid wall cornice, and brackets on main building appear inauthentic.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist		
Siting of Buildings		
1.	Maintenance of residential park setting	Added trees not much in the way of landscaping but suitable for such a site
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	Uncertain
7.	Overlook and privacy issues	Ok
8.	Transition between private and public space	Ok
9.	Accessory buildings	Well done
Design of Buildings		
1.	General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Nicely composed
2.	Roofscape	Simple
3.	Flashing	Trim and details
4.	Lighting	Ok
5.	Garages and outbuildings	The garage is nice
Landscaping		
1.	Fencing and screening	Ok
2.	Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	n/a
3.	Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	Modest but in keeping with neighbourhood
4.	Play and recreation areas	n/a
5.	Hard landscaping	Ok
6.	Parking and driveways	Well done

It was moved and seconded to recommend ADP00121 be approved.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

c) DP000030 – 713 St Patrick Street

To facilitate construction of a mixed-use commercial / multifamily building.

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

- The proposal is for a three storey multi-use building consisting of ground floor retail / commercial space with six multi-unit residential dwellings above.
- Variances are requested to accommodate additional height and reduced on-site parking.
- Design cues have been taken from the surrounding neighbourhood, referencing the more traditional forms with a peaked roof design, cement board siding resembling board and batten cladding, and stone base.
- Proposal should be reviewed as it pertains to Official Community Plan guidelines.
- The parking component is under review with the engineering and planning departments.

M. Hardcastle, applicant presented the application. Some of the comments were:

- Existing building which has served community for 71 years is no longer economically viable and will be replaced with a three storey multi-use building.
- Design concept was developed by incorporating resident's feedback after community consultation sessions; guidelines of design and neighbourhood wishes aligned; contemporary designed lower portion with traditional roof forms above.
- The proposal includes providing BC Transit personnel with a private restroom facility.
- Transportation report advises 10 parking stalls will satisfy parking demand; parking measures include transit passes and e-bikes for residents, and on street parking.

- Existing perimeter vegetation will be retained, and additional plantings of native, low maintenance vegetation and trees will increase the canopy cover.

Panel Comments

- Confirmed that living spaces will not be compromised by reduction of ceiling height.
- Design is consistent with architecture in the neighbourhood; sensible and supportable design; requests are well founded and successful; awnings used well to shrink the upper two storeys; successful improvement to the neighbourhood; building will be an amenity to provide diverse experiences.
- Questioned reduction of parking requirement from 21 to 10; concerned that parking will be inadequate; parking component is an issue but should be left for engineering and planning to evaluate and ultimately council for a final decision. Suggested on-site parking be utilized as either entirely residential or entirely commercial rather than a mixture which could lead to confusion.
- Ensure consistency of overhangs on drawings.
- Confirmed visual separation elements to denote private and public spaces such as additional glazing, tall sculptural planter, juxtaposition of roofing, vertical colour to separate the public building; alternate entry for the private residences.
- Questioned whether the approval of an over-height building will set a precedent for other buildings to build over-height; confirmed with staff that C2 zone does not contain lot coverage nor roof height components to it.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist	
Siting of Buildings	
1. Maintenance of residential park setting	n/a
2. Setbacks	n/a
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Large, over height, but well concealed and variances are well founded, and suitable for the design.
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Well composed.
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Larger building, but very much in keeping with neighbourhood
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	Shadows do fall on northern neighbour, but minimalized
7. Overlook and privacy issues	Focused on street corner, some over eastern neighbour
8. Transition between private and public space	good
9. Accessory buildings	n/a
Design of Buildings	
1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Well done
2. Roofscape	Well done
3. Flashing	In keeping with local residential architecture
4. Lighting	appropriate
5. Garages and outbuildings	n/a
Landscaping	
1. Fencing and screening	appropriate
2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	n/a
3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	appropriate
4. Play and recreation areas	n/a
5. Hard landscaping	appropriate
6. Parking and driveways	Under review. Unclear if public, private or combination

It was moved and approved seconded to recommend that DP000032 be approved.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

- d) DP000032 – 2140 Cadboro Bay Road
To facilitate balcony replacement on a portion of the multifamily building.

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

- Multi-family building built in 1956, with additional units built in 1985.
- Exterior alterations are limited to the replacement of deteriorating solid wood balcony guard rails from to an aluminum and glass system; replacement is for the rear building balconies only.

N. Showers, applicant, noted that the existing guards on the rear building are deteriorating and will be replaced with an aluminum and glass system. The location on the site causes minimal visual impact. At present, she stated, only the rear building balcony guards are to be replaced.

Panel Comments

Panel members indicated that the proposal is a long overdue Improvement.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist		
Siting of Buildings		
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	n/a
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	n/a
9.	Accessory buildings	n/a
Design of Buildings		
1.	General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	n/a
2.	Roofscape	n/a
3.	Flashing	Well done
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 approved seconded to recommend that DP000032 be approved.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

6. Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Tuesday, October 6, 2020.

7. Motion to Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:11 am.

Certified as fair and accurate:

Chair

Recorder

