



MINUTES
OAK BAY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2020 AT 8:45 AM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MUNICIPAL HALL, 2167 OAK BAY AVENUE

MEMBERS PRESENT

Frans Compeer Carl Peterson
Will King Councillor Cairine Green

MEMBERS ABSENT

Justin Gammon

STAFF PRESENT

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

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8:50 am.

2. Adoption of Minutes from September 1, 2020

It was moved and seconded that the minutes from September 1, 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 November 3, 2020 be approved.
The motion was carried.
None opposed.

4. Old Business

a) DP000026 – 1476 Beach Drive
To facilitate replacement of balcony railings on a multifamily residential building.

- G. Buffett provided an overview of the application. Some of the comments were:
- Application was previously reviewed by the panel on April 30, 2019 and February 4, 2020; design has been revised to better reflect the building form and character.
 - T. Williams, architect, has submitted the revised design.
 - Proposed works update the exterior balcony by replacing corroded wrought iron railing with powder-coated aluminum and glass rail system.

- T. Williams, architect presented the application. Some of his comments were:
- Design maintains form and character of the building.
 - Original 60s design very simple; wrought iron was introduced later.
 - Life safety is a consideration in addition to the design; current railings do not meet safety requirements.

Panel Comments

- Clarified that the proposal is limited to the guard and handrails.
- Proposal is simple, clean, and straightforward.
- Confirmed that non-combustible hardieboard will replace and replicate the existing plywood soffits, and that the building attachment mechanism will be assessed and addressed with no impact to the design.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist	
Siting of Buildings	
1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Not applicable.
2. Setbacks	Not applicable.
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Not applicable.
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Not applicable.
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Not applicable.
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	Not applicable.
7. Overlook and privacy issues	Not applicable.
8. Transition between private and public space	Not applicable.
9. Accessory buildings	Not applicable.
Design of Buildings	
1. General massing, proportion, and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	In keeping with existing balcony – original balcony is similar.
2. Roofscape	Not applicable.
3. Flashing	Not applicable.
4. Lighting	Not applicable.
5. Garages and outbuildings	Not applicable.
Landscaping	
1. Fencing and screening	Not applicable.
2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	Not applicable.
3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	Not applicable.
4. Play and recreation areas	Not applicable.
5. Hard landscaping	Not applicable.
6. Parking and driveways	Not applicable.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that DP00026 be approved.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

5. New Business

- a) ADP00125 – 3020 Lansdowne Road
To facilitate construction of a single-family home.

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

- Proposal is to build a two-storey home designed with a Georgian influence, with a symmetrical façade and wings on either side.
- Elements include brick cladding, solid wood windows and doors and precast sills; the existing swimming pool will be refinished, and an accessory building constructed next to the pool.
- No trees to be removed, and tree canopy will be increased with the addition of 37 new trees in a variety of sizes and species.
- No variances are requested.

T. Rodier, designer presented the application. Some of the comments were:

- Family home will replace existing home using some of the same footprint.
- Proposal is for a two-storey house on crawlspace; intent is to present a nice façade and take full advantage of ample backyard space; mature landscaping will be retained.
- Home will be designed to BC Energy Step Code Level 4.
- Finishes include full brick cladding; fenestrations feature detailed brick courses at window and door heads, windowsills will be in light coloured precast concrete; roof will be in a darker finish, windows will be clad in black aluminum to provide contrast.

Panel Comments

- Proposal has provided comprehensive landscaping and is using high quality construction materials and finishes.
- Design does not resemble other dwellings within 500 feet as set out in the Uplands Bylaw.
- The house size works well on the lot, and the Lansdowne facade is an improvement.
- Confirmed that the existing hedge will be cut back along the frontage.
- Consider removing fencing, other than the pool fencing, along Exeter Road to enhance the park like setting atmosphere.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist		
Siting of Buildings		
1.	Maintenance of residential park setting	Yes, important at corner of lot.
2.	Setbacks	Not applicable.
3.	Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Good design.
4.	Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Similar to existing.
5.	Relationship to adjacent buildings	Similar to existing.
6.	Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	Not applicable.
7.	Overlook and privacy issues	Not applicable.
8.	Transition between private and public space	Very similar to existing - improvement
9.	Accessory buildings	Good and design compliance.
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	High quality. Well detailed.
4.	Lighting	Not applicable.
5.	Garages and outbuildings	In keeping with design.
Landscaping		
1.	Fencing and screening	Remove hedge at corner. Keep existing is good.
2.	Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	Yes.
3.	Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	Keep as much existing. Is good.
4.	Play and recreation areas	Not applicable.
5.	Hard landscaping	Well done.
6.	Parking and driveways	Keep existing. New garage to side yard.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that ADP00125 be approved.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

- b) ADP00126 / DVP00102 – 2740 Beach Drive
To facilitate construction of a single-family home.

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

- Proposal is to build a two-storey contemporary styled home, with elements including natural materials such as red cedar and stone quarried in BC.
- Two accessory buildings are proposed, one for the north side and a second located in the south side of the rear yard; a variance is requested for the north accessory building as it does not meet the required interior side lot line setback.
- The addition of 15 trees in a variety of species and size will contribute to the park like setting of the Uplands neighborhood; four protected trees will be removed, with three of those in poor health and one within the building footprint.

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

- Design includes ample glazing while being mindful of neighbour privacy.
- Neighbours have been consulted and submitted letters in support of the variance.
- Proposed variance for the accessory building will allow for more usable green space, visual impact of the accessory building from the street or adjacent neighbour is minimal.
- Accessory building will accommodate additional storage and a bathroom.

Panel Comments

- Overall design is simple, modern and uncomplicated; fenestration pattern is disorganized.
- No compelling reason to support the variance; accessory building use is undefined.
- Details have not been provided for trim types or window details, or to address connection to the ground.
- South elevation is uninspiring and the roof line is problematic.
- Feature wall at the front of the house would read better on the opposite side of the door.
- Confirmed house will be built on a crawlspace; connection to foundation will be ICF perimeter wall and will match cladding and be coated with a scratch coat stucco.
- Usefulness of the yard increases when accessory buildings are out of the way.
- Accessory building uses could be incorporated into the main structure so long as the floor area ratio would accommodate the additional space.

In summary, the Panel noted the design could be improved, but overall the application meets the general form and character guidelines for the Uplands. However, the Panel questioned whether losing usable yard space necessitates a variance when the design is not dependant on the location of the accessory buildings.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist	
Siting of Buildings	
1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Okay.
2. Setbacks	Not good. Setback variance not recommended. Accessory building is not key part of design. Not rational.
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Okay.
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Okay.
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Okay.
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	Okay.
7. Overlook and privacy issues	Okay.
8. Transition between private and public space	Okay.
9. Accessory buildings	They seem unnecessary.
Design of Buildings	
1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Okay. Not great, but acceptable.
2. Roofscape	Okay. Modern flat roof – not inspiring design but okay, just okay.
3. Flashing	Not applicable.
4. Lighting	Not applicable.
5. Garages and outbuildings	Did not offer much improvement. Could not rationalize.
Landscaping	
1. Fencing and screening	Okay.
2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	Okay.
3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	Okay.
4. Play and recreation areas	Okay.
5. Hard landscaping	Okay.
6. Parking and driveways	Okay.

It was moved and seconded to recommend ADP00126, for Uplands design, be approved.
The motion was carried.
F. Compeer opposed.

It was moved and seconded to recommend DVP00102, for the proposed variance for the north accessory building, be denied.

The motion was carried.
W. King opposed.

c) ADP00127 – 2727 Dover Road

To facilitate renovations to a single family home.

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

- Proposal is for renovations and an addition at the rear of the 1960s single storey home.
- Proposed finishes include vertical wood cladding, vinyl windows with wood trim, and asphalt shingles that will match the existing house.
- No trees proposed to be removed; one large canopy tree to be planted.

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

- Proposal was triggered by the owner's increasing mobility issues.
- A Garry oak will be planted to satisfy the large canopy tree requirement.

Panel Comments

- Proposed application is straightforward, and the house is very well maintained.
- Confirmed that existing cedar hedge located along the side of the house will conceal the addition from the neighbouring property.
- Suggested that a variance would be supportable for the legal nonconforming siting to square off the bump out at the rear.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist	
Siting of Buildings	
1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Yes.
2. Setbacks	Good. Not necessary to move wall a few inches but applicant has done so anyway to comply.
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Yes.
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Good. – Not noticeable difference.
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Not applicable. – very similar to existing.
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	
7. Overlook and privacy issues	Not applicable.
8. Transition between private and public space	Not applicable.
9. Accessory buildings	Not applicable.
Design of Buildings	
1. General massing, proportion, overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Good. In keeping with original building.
2. Roofscape	Good. In keeping with original building.
3. Flashing	Not applicable.
4. Lighting	Not applicable.
5. Garages and outbuildings	Not applicable.
Landscaping	
1. Fencing and screening	Not applicable.
2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	Not applicable.
3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	Not applicable.
4. Play and recreation areas	Not applicable.
5. Hard landscaping	Not applicable.
6. Parking and driveways	Not applicable.

It was moved and approved seconded to recommend that ADP00127 be approved.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

6. Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Tuesday, December 1, 2020.

7. Motion to Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 10:31 am.

Certified as fair and accurate:

Chair

Recorder

