



MINUTES
OAK BAY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2017 AT 8:45 AM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MUNICIPAL HALL, 2167 OAK BAY AVENUE

MEMBERS PRESENT

Kim Milburn
John Armitage
James Kerr

Will King
David Wilkinson
Councillor Tom Croft

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

STAFF PRESENT

Deborah Jensen, Manager of Planning
Graeme Buffet, Planning Technician
Krista Mitchell, Building and Planning Clerk

1. Call to Order

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

2. Adoption of Minutes from January 3, 2017

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes from January 3, 2017 be adopted as amended.
The motion was carried.
None opposed.

3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items

4. Old Business

- a) ADP00047 – 3140 Beach Drive– Uplands Siting and Design
To permit construction of a single family home.

J.Grieves, applicant, presented the revised proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Traditional style family home with stone face that is sited well back from the road.
- Two principle flanking gables and Palladian window have been eliminated to simplify the house design.
- Landscape plan will include planting two mature Garry oaks trees that will flank the driveway.

Panel Comments

Panel members confirmed the garden pavilion will be clad in real stone, suggested the applicant give consideration as to how stone work meets the ground, and noted the new home across the street has a similar stone finish.

D. Jensen noted the guidelines speak to dwellings being distinct from others in proximity, and not just exterior finishes.

Panel members inquired about the use of dormers facing the street.

J. Grieves, applicant, advised the dormers will be used as light wells, not as livable area.

In summary, the Panel members noted the following:

- Reinforce dark sky principles, with no up lighting.
- Doors should be constructed from renewable resources.
- Flanking windows of the arched window at rear should be removed.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Achieved well
2. Setbacks	Appropriate
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Excellent
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Well handled
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Well considered
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	N/A
7. Overlook and privacy issues	N/A
8. Transition between private and public space	Good
9. Accessory buildings	Good

Design of Buildings

1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Excellent
2. Roofscape	Well considered
3. Flashing	Good
4. Lighting	Night sky principles to be applied
3. Garages and outbuildings	Good

Landscaping

1. Fencing and screening	Good
2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	Some removal/replacement
3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	New oaks included
4. Play and recreation areas	Good
5. Hard landscaping	Good
6. Parking and driveways	Excellent

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00047.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

- b) ADP00059 – 3155 Sherringham Place – Uplands Siting and Design
To permit construction of a single family home.

T. Rados and B. Rados, applicant, presented the revised proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Changed the proportions of the home by introducing two new roof vents on the front of the house, increased the roof pitch and roof height, and increased the main floor ceiling height to 10 feet.
- All elevations will have the same window trim and corner detailing.
- Rear elevation roof line has been modified, windows and roof vents added.
- Confirmed tree in front yard is being retained.

Panel Comments

Panel members commented that the design of the building seems more settled and calmer, that exterior lighting should be cast downward and window trim detail may be excessive on rear elevation, and asked about column size for pediment support.

T. Rados, applicant, confirmed that columns will be 16"x16" and a consistent size throughout the home, that casement windows and stucco siding will be used, and that they will not be using aluminum soffits.

Panel members cautioned the applicants that the concrete balustrades may be problematic due to spaces between spindles and ability to meet building code, and that they should create a lighter, homogeneous look.

Panel members suggested the proposed vinyl windows will not create the slender look proposed for the neoclassical home, and top floor windows should not include muntins and should maintain the same proportion as main floor windows. They also noted that the railing at the rear of the home would be better as wood colour aluminum and inquired about the foundation and front door design.

T. Rados, applicant, confirmed the house base will be concrete with colour to match stucco, and front doors will have full glass panel with wrought iron detail.

Panel members inquired about the proposed removal of a Douglas fir tree and Garry oak tree as well as paving over the root circle over a couple of trees.

T. Rados, applicant, noted the arborist report supports the proposed landscape plan, that paving stones will be used at the front of the home and concrete for the remainder, and that trees will be replaced at 2 for 1.

D. Jensen commented that the municipal arborist has been on the site and is satisfied with the tree protection plan that is in place.

Panel members suggested the applicant consider using dark colours for the windows and doors as white seems cold on this design. They also commented on other unresolved details of the design, including:

- Traditional homes don't have much colour contrast.
- Consider how the soffits are finished on the underside of the eaves.
- Balustrades need to be fat and spaced far apart to feel natural.
- Remove the belt and keep the building as a two storey mass.
- Where the building meets the ground is also important.
- As the overall massing has improved from the previous application, the roof should be extended over the garage doors to join the roof each side.

It was moved and seconded that ADP00059 be tabled to a subsequent meeting of the Advisory Design Panel.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

- c) DP000014 – 2200 Oak Bay Avenue – Form and Character
To permit modifications to the exterior of the Pharmasave building.

R. Collins, applicant, and A. Tucker, owner of Pharmasave, presented the revised proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Horizontal wood siding under store windows is replaced by a Longboard metal product.
- Building face is broken into three sections on two planes, with the feature window in the mid-section of the storefront being a bit proud of the two flanking sections.
- Black matte fabric awning is divided into three sections and window frames are silver.

Panel Comments

Panel members inquired about awning modifications, confirmed windows will be a clear aluminum anodized material, and noted black awning open ends allow in natural light.

R. Collins, applicant, confirmed awning will have three distinct sections with a white stucco wall above the window head, and the soffit will be the Longboard material with pot lights.

Panel members commented that the rounding of the corner towards to the bank would remain as discussed in a previous meeting.

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	Appropriate
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Appropriate
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Appropriate
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	Acceptable
2. Roofscape	N/A
3. Flashing	Acceptable
4. Lighting	Acceptable
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	Appropriate
6. Parking and driveways	N/A

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve DP00014.

The motion was carried.
J. Armitage opposed.

5. New Business

- a) ADP00062 – 3165 Midland Road – Uplands Siting and Design
To permit construction of a single family home.

T. Martin, applicant, and H. Donais, owner presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- This is a modern design home sited further back on the lot from the existing home to ensure privacy from the street and neighbours.
- Large projecting overhang allows natural lighting, and garage is located in lower level.
- Interior / exterior fireplace proposed.
- Post and beam structure with timber frame detail, wood soffit similar in colour to siding.
- Large buffer of trees at the back of the property and landscaping will be kept as natural as possible. The loss of existing trees is based on where the new building is sited.

Panel Comments

D. Jensen advised the municipal arborist has reviewed the proposal and notes five Garry oak trees will be removed, as well as one additional tree located in the patio area.

Panel members advised a site plan showing tree locations is essential for review, and noted the home could be sited closer to the front lot line to help preserve trees.

T. Martin, applicant, noted that tree #930 located northeast of the patio is essentially dead, and that the house was set back in order to make the driveway grade work. He also indicated they would confirm the maximum building height.

Panel members commented the design and fence detail does not reflect Uplands guidelines of maintaining an open park like setting as the fence and front gate undermines a park like setting, and suggested landscaping could demarcate private space.

Panel members also advised there are no windows on the front side of the home that would allow you to see the street, suggesting secrecy, and the front of the home would enjoy western exposure; the design turns its back on the neighbourhood.

In summary, the Panel members noted the following:

- Expand a high standard of modern design with more clarity needed.
- Private side nicely composed with transparency, but front of house needs additional consideration.
- Fencing is typically at rear of property, connecting the house at the side.
- Improvements needed to landscaping, and driveway has too much impact on trees and will require safety fencing. Could push garage doors under house so there is less impact on landscape.
- Consider moving the house to save additional trees.

It was moved and seconded that ADP00062 be tabled to a subsequent meeting of the Advisory Design Panel.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

- b) ADP00063 – 3200 Exeter Road – Uplands Siting and Design
To permit renovations to an existing single family home.

R. Collins, applicant, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Original home designed by DiCastrì, renovations intended to update home but be true to original design, brick cladding to be replaced by natural ledgerstone.
- Revise existing windows and front entry canopy, and repaint existing stucco.
- Install horizontal cedar siding with semi-transparent colour and remove planters.
- Metal stair guard railings will be repainted and incorporate glass panels.
- Exposed wood beams and ends to be refinished with same stain as doors.
- Carport to be enclosed, with metal glazed doors installed on south and north elevations.

Panel Comments

Panel members commented reverse battered wall ends (fins) on the carport are a signature detail of DiCastrì and should be retained but could be extended at each end, that vinyl windows are not the best replacement choice, that the frosted privacy screen does not reflect the home's character, and DiCastrì elements could be made stronger.

R. Collins, applicant, was in agreement to extending the fins as part of the enclosed garage, and advised they will keep and restore existing windows if possible.

In summary, the Panel members noted careful detailing is required as part of enclosing the garage, and requested revised plans be brought back for information at a later date.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Existing unchanged
2. Setbacks	Existing unchanged
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Existing unchanged except carport enclosure is acceptable
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Existing unchanged
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Existing unchanged
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	Existing unchanged
7. Overlook and privacy issues	Existing unchanged
8. Transition between private and public space	Carport enclosure acceptable
9. Accessory buildings	N/A

Design of Buildings

1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	No major change
2. Roofscape	No change
3. Flashing	No change
4. Lighting	Dark sky principles to be applied
5. Garages and outbuildings	Enclosed carport acceptable provided the open feel is maintained carefully.

Landscaping

1. Fencing and screening	No change
2. Native plants and vegetation	No change
3. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	No change
4. Play and recreation areas	No change
5. Hard landscaping	No change
6. Parking and driveways	No change

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00063.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

- c) ADP00064 – 3145 Exeter Road – Uplands Siting and Design
To permit renovations to an existing single family home.

M. Huxley, applicant, gave a summary of the proposal, noting this application was to address changes to a previously approved design.

- Replacing brick finishing for cleaner design, grout was in poor condition.
- Proposed stone will be brought down to grade and around the side of the stairs.
- Using K2 stone, Ocean Mist ledgerstone gray slate, installed in a linear fashion.
- Cedar beveled siding replaced stucco and new trim around windows.

Panel Comments

Panel members inquired about stone placement, and noted it may be appropriate to install stone on central portion of home only, with siding on flanking portions.

M. Huxley, applicant, advised that stone will come down to grade and return on corners by 6" to 8", and that the bay window area will be left as siding.

D. Jensen confirmed the recommendation is to approve the application, but stone installation only for the central portion of the home with siding on the flanking ends.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Appropriate
2. Setbacks	No change from previous approved design
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Changes are appropriate
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Good
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Good
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	No concern
7. Overlook and privacy issues	No concern
8. Transition between private and public space	Appropriate
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	No changes from previously approved design.
3. Flashing	Acceptable
4. Lighting	No change
5. Garages and outbuildings	N/A

Landscaping

1. Fencing and screening	No change from previously approved design.
2. Native plants and vegetation	No change from previously approved design.
3. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	No change from previously approved design.
4. Play and recreation areas	No change from previously approved design.
5. Hard landscaping	No change from previously approved design.
6. Parking and driveways	No change from previously approved design.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00064.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

- d) ADP00065 – 2345 Cadboro Bay Road – Subdivision
To permit construction of a single family dwelling on a subdivided lot.

K. Khaira, applicant, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Traditional styled home to compliment neighbouring properties and protect oak trees.
- Materials are earth toned, using rock, hardie plank shingles, black windows, and stamped concrete driveway.

Panel Comments

Panel member suggested a ventilated hardie board or vinyl bead board soffit is preferable to an aluminum soffit, and inquired how trees would be protected.

K. Khaira, applicant, noted the arborist report states a single birch tree is to be removed as it is dead, that oak trees will be protected during construction, and that a covenant specifies siting of the driveway to protect the tree clusters.

D. Jensen reported the District arborist indicates much of this site is impacted by root zones and trees were removed during the subdivision process. She also noted outstanding work must be addressed as part of the tree protection plan.

In summary, the Panel members noted the following:

- Decrease the size of the circular window on the front elevation and garage windows.
- Correct the window siting along the stone ledges and utilize dark sky principles.
- Keep out of the root zone.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

1. Maintenance of residential park setting	N/A (not Uplands)
2. Setbacks	Conforming and acceptable
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Appropriate to an existing streetscape.
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Appropriate to an existing streetscape.
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Appropriate to an existing streetscape.
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	Minimal
7. Overlook and privacy issues	Minimal and acceptable
8. Transition between private and public space	Acceptable
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	Appropriate
3. Flashing	Appropriate
4. Lighting	Dark sky principles to apply
5. Garages and outbuildings	N/A

Landscaping

1. Fencing and screening	Appropriate
2. Native plants and vegetation	Natural covenant applies, is respected.
3. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	Natural covenant applies, is respected.
4. Play and recreation areas	Good
5. Hard landscaping	-
6. Parking and driveways	Acceptable

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00065.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

6. Information Items

None.

7. Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Tuesday, March 7, 2017.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:03 pm.