



**MINUTES**  
**OAK BAY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL**  
**TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2016 AT 8:45 AM**  
**COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MUNICIPAL HALL, 2167 OAK BAY AVENUE**

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Lynn Gordon-Finlay, Chair  
John Armitage  
James Kerr

Andrea Nemeth  
David Wilkinson  
Councillor Tom Croft

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

None

**STAFF PRESENT**

Deborah Jensen, Planner

Krista Mitchell, Building/Planning Clerk

**1. Call to Order**

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

**2. Adoption of Minutes**

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes from December 1, 2015 be adopted.

The motion was carried.  
None opposed.

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes from January 5, 2016 be adopted as amended.

The motion was carried.  
None opposed.

**3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items**

The agenda was approved as presented.

**4. Old Business**

- a. ADP00029 – 3250 Exeter Road – Uplands Siting and Design  
To permit exterior renovations and addition to the existing house.

J. Martin, applicant, presented the proposal with modifications as discussed at the January meeting of the Advisory Design Panel. Some of the comments were:

- Streamlined the overall design including changes to window detail.
- Windows around the indoor pool area have been enlarged with black metal trim and stucco has changed to wood siding.
- Mechanical equipment will be under the pool, with exposed ducting placed around interior of the pool area. No equipment will be sited on roof of building.
- Stucco will be carried around to the front of the house.

### **Panel Comments**

The Panel members commented that the revised design is much improved, and suggested the applicant consider:

- Provide additional focus to front entry (for example, use real stone over artificial stone, accentuate handrail, use contemporary details, focus on adjacent walls); and
- Utilize a lighting scheme that incorporates dark sky principles to mitigate light pollution and highlight the house from below

The Panel reiterated their concern regarding moisture impacts of an indoor pool, and encouraged separation if possible.

### **Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist**

#### **Siting of Buildings**

1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Recommend dark sky principles for exterior lighting scheme.
2. Setbacks	No variances
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Appropriate
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Positive
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Minimal change
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	None
7. Overlook and privacy issues	Negligible, except avoid placing mechanical equipment on roof.
8. Transition between private and public space	Front entry steps require careful detailing at either side of stair, otherwise good.
9. Accessory buildings	Nicely treated

#### **Design of Buildings**

1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Little change from existing
2. Roofscape	Improvement, skylight slope requires consideration
3. Garages and outbuildings	Good

#### **Landscaping**

1. Fencing and screening	No fencing in front maintains park like setting. Rear yard fully fenced
2. Native plants and vegetation	Some
3. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	Oaks preserved, no major trees protected
4. Play and recreation areas	Extensive
5. Hard landscaping	Appropriate
6. Parking and driveways	Existing driveway unchanged from asphalt

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00029.

The motion was carried.  
None opposed.

b. ADP00034 – 48 Maquinna - Subdivision

To permit construction of a single family dwelling on a newly subdivided lot.

R. Collins, applicant, presented the proposal with modifications as discussed at the January meeting of the Advisory Design Panel. Some of the comments were:

- Added treatment around driveway.
- Defined entries by widening walkway to front door and installing landscaping on the walkways.
- Garage doors are wood; glazing is preferred but exceeds BC Building code requirements.
- Front wall is intended to look monolithic, do not want to break it up with windows, so design is as originally submitted.
- The two new homes, including this one, will have driveway access from Maquinna Street, and their siting is based on keeping driveways separated to provide as much sunlight as possible to the living space.

***Panel Comments***

A Panel member suggested the applicant consider beach side landscaping such as flax and salal, to provide habitat for wildlife. Panel members also commented that some glazing in the garage doors would be preferred, the front entry needs to be further emphasized, and that there is a disconnect between the residence 'angles' as compared to the 'radius' of the driveway.

R. Collins stated the preference is to keep the design as simple as possible, and indicated any addition to the front entry overhang would exceed the maximum permitted floor area. Skylights may be considered.

A Panel member stated that the overall application is improved and sited well. However, Panel members also indicated that further simplification of the overall concept is needed, and offered the following considerations:

- Relationship between fireplace siting and glazing above it, and think about rationale for exterior of fireplace.
- Placement of patio doors as they relate to great room, and consider providing a clear view from the great room to the back yard.
- Addition of tall glazing on each side of the fireplace, and delete blank wall above the fireplace, explore simplified compositions for the north elevation.
- Stairwell window disproportionate in size, could move higher.
- Placement of window in bedroom above garage provides opportunity for views.
- Consider paving to front door and use planter boxes to demarcate.

J. Kerr left the meeting at 10:47 am.

T. Croft left the meeting at 10:50 am.

### Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

#### Siting of Buildings

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Maintenance of residential park setting                  | Appropriate: not inconsistent with neighborhood             |
| 2. Setbacks   | No variances  |
| 3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area | One of many other modern homes in the area.                 |
| 4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development                | Appropriate   |
| 5. Relationship to adjacent buildings                       | Fine  |
| 6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties              | None  |
| 7. Overlook and privacy issues                              | Stairwell window can be reconsidered for privacy.           |
| 8. Transition between private and public space              | Front entry should be redesigned as a verandah and enlarged |
| 9. Accessory buildings                                      | N/A   |

#### Design of Buildings

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing | Appropriate                                    |
| 2. Roofscape   | Some simplification of roofline is recommended |
| 3. Garages and outbuildings  | Recommend glazed doors in garage               |

#### Landscaping

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Fencing and screening  | Fence/hedge along east property line to be kept low                              |
| 2. Native plants and vegetation                                 | Keep low, natural, unstructured  |
| 3. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material | N/A  |
| 4. Play and recreation areas                                    | Recommended for front yard, lawn for sunny spots.                                |
| 5. Hard landscaping   | Good sharing of vehicle and pedestrian areas. Encourage paving to the front door |
| 6. Parking and driveways  | See 4 & 5  |

R. Collins indicated the drawings will be revised as per Panel discussion prior to submitting them for Council consideration.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00034 subject to the recommendations outlined in the assessment checklist.

The motion was carried.  
None opposed.

## 5. New Business

- a. ADP00030 – 430 St Patrick (Lot 1) – Subdivision

To permit construction of a single family dwelling on a newly subdivided lot.

T. Rodier, applicant, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Proposing a traditional style home with entry facing Beach Drive; home and patio will take advantage of water views.
- House designed to flow from front to rear, majority of outdoor living in the rear yard.
- Craftsman style with contemporary edges, shingles, and board and batten siding.
- Reusing some granite from the original house removed as part of the subdivision.

- Standing seamed metal roof, with 9/12 pitch sloop.
- Exterior materials include James Hardie cement products, colour plus system.

### **Panel Comments**

Panel members inquired regarding the use of James Hardie materials, whether a corner board was provided at every corner, and commented that the panels should be more evenly spaced,

T. Rodier confirmed that James Hardie product shingles are pre manufactured, good for longevity, and do not give a tiled appearance. Every corner will have a corner board, preferably minimalistic mitred with a three inch profile that the board sits against.

Panel members stated the application is agreeable as presented, identifying features such as the split driveway and upstairs central hallway, stating the proposal is a good addition to the neighbourhood.

### **Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist**

#### **Siting of Buildings**

- |   |                         |
|---|-------------------------|
| 1. Maintenance of residential park setting                  | Good                    |
| 2. Setbacks   | No variances            |
| 3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area | Excellent               |
| 4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development                | Good                    |
| 5. Relationship to adjacent buildings                       | Respectful              |
| 6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties              | None: normal            |
| 7. Overlook and privacy issues                              | Great overlook to ocean |
| 8. Transition between private and public space              | Well done               |
| 9. Accessory buildings                                      | Cute, nice              |

#### **Design of Buildings**

- |  |                               |
|--|-------------------------------|
| 1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing | Good addition to neighborhood |
| 2. Roofscape   | Nicely handled                |
| 3. Garages and outbuildings  | Good                          |

#### **Landscaping**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Fencing and screening  | Consider fully fencing backyard, at least garden area                    |
| 2. Native plants and vegetation                                 | Encourage wild life habitat in front, consider wind proof plants/screens |
| 3. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material | See arborist report  |
| 4. Play and recreation areas                                    | Well placed  |
| 5. Hard landscaping   | Very nice re-use of granite from relocated house                         |
| 6. Parking and driveways  | Good   |

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00030 subject to the recommendations outlined in the assessment checklist.

The motion was carried.  
None opposed.

b. ADP00031 – 430 St Patrick (Lot 2) - Subdivision

To permit construction of a single family dwelling on a newly subdivided lot.

T. Rodier, applicant, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Proposal is for a modern styled house with a layout similar to Lot 1, utilizing main floor living space and rear yard entertainment space.
- A play area is proposed in the hedged front yard; with an accessory building and lawn and garden space in the rear yard.
- Vehicle access will be off St. Patrick Street, with the garage towards the rear.
- Design is a contrast between light and dark. Both are very rectangular with the main body of the house in white stucco and the lower floor having brick components. Slightly sloped frame of the cedar portion will be used to tie in and balance the brick and stucco, as the cedar will give softness and warmth.

***Panel Comments***

Panel members stated a number of concerns regarding the proposed design, including:

- Design utilizes too many materials, how the parts come together needs to be simplified.
- Consider a flat roof as the sloped roof does not work where it meets up to the other elements.
- Roof overhang designs are inadequate.
- Utilize simple box design or produce layering with thin roof edges.
- Disconnect between the siting of uses, for example, the kitchen, in relation to the rear yard; requires fundamental moves. Consider the relationship between the house and the landscape.
- Simplify and consider the massing and placement of materials.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that ADP00031 be tabled to a subsequent meeting of the Advisory Design Panel.

The motion was carried.  
None opposed.

**6. Information Items**

a. ADP Binder / Informational Materials

D. Jensen distributed Advisory Design Panel volunteer manuals to the Panel members.

**7. Next Meeting**

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel is Tuesday, March 1, 2016.

**8. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 pm.