



MINUTES
OAK BAY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL
TUESDAY, JULY 4, 2017 AT 8:45 AM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MUNICIPAL HALL, 2167 OAK BAY AVENUE

MEMBERS PRESENT

John Armitage
James Kerr

David Wilkinson

MEMBERS ABSENT

Kim Milburn
Will King
Councillor Tom Croft

STAFF PRESENT

Deborah Jensen, Acting Director of Building and Planning
Graeme Buffett, 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 June 6, 2017

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes from June 6, 2017 be adopted as amended.
The motion was carried.
None opposed.

3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items

The agenda was approved as presented.

4. New Business

- a) ADP00071 – 3350 Weald Road – Uplands Siting and Design
To permit construction of a single family home.

W. Peereboom, applicant, D. Mlynarowich, applicant, and S. Barton, owner, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Proposing Edwardian style with elements of British arts and crafts.
- Heavy granite faced foundation, tall ornamented chimney, stucco wall cladding with smooth natural wood trims, and eave brackets under the large bell roof overhang.
- Roof will incorporate Tesla solar power shingles and Powerwall.
- Use existing driveway crossing and try to reuse existing retaining walls.

Panel Comments

Panel members inquired about the siting of the proposed in ground pool; commented that the wood burning fireplace chimney is too small, too short, and should be higher than the ridgeline; and noted the painted wood brackets on underside of eaves are not consistent with the Edwardian style.

W. Peereboom, applicant, advised the proposed siting of proposed pool will result in the loss of two cedar trees, but siting elsewhere would impact Garry oak trees, and also noted replacement trees are proposed.

S. Barton, owner, commented that siting of the proposed pool was done in consultation with the neighbours to have as little impact as possible and to save the Garry oak trees.

Panel members suggested the Edwardian styled windows be improved by separating the cross frame and transom, and casing the whole window would improve the overall weight of the windows. They also noted columns should be more consistent and more significant, that the stone base was not needed, and inquired whether the home would utilize an external heat pump and the steps taking to address sound abatement.

W. Peereboom, applicant, advised an external heat pump will be used for the house and the noise making pool equipment will be situated in the pool house.

Panel members cautioned the applicant to be mindful of dark sky principles and maintain the parklike setting, and suggested pushing the fence back beyond the veranda. They also commented that: the garden experience could be improved by linking the pedestrian pathways; that they could support removal of two cedar trees so long as a replanting program is undertaken; that a Garry oak planting design is recommended for the northwest corner of the site; and that landscaping should be organic, with a softer, layered approach and less formal, but complimentary to the streetscape.

W. Peereboom, applicant, advised the front and side yards will have a four foot fence, transitioning to a six foot fence in the back yard.

D. Jensen noted the Municipal arborist prefers the pool be built in another location to save the two healthy cedar trees.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Generally achieved
2. Setbacks	Appropriate and conforming
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Appropriate
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Good
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Good
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	Negligible
7. Overlook and privacy issues	None
8. Transition between private and public space	Generally appropriate, see comments re: formal-informal landscape treatment at front yard.
9. Accessory buildings	Satisfactory

Design of Buildings

1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Appropriate
2. Roofscape	Appropriate
3. Flashing	Acceptable
4. Lighting	Acceptable based on deletion of proposed tree uplighting
5. Garages and outbuildings	Acceptable

Landscaping

1. Fencing and screening	Appropriate, see comments re: fence location
2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	Panel believes that on balance, removal of 2 existing cedars can be justified with the understanding that replacement trees will compensate long term loss of canopy.
3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	Preservation of existing oaks achieved.
4. Play and recreation areas	Good
5. Hard landscaping	Appropriate
6. Parking and driveways	Appropriate

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00071.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

b) ADP00072 – 3150 Norfolk Road

To permit an addition to an existing single family home.

G. Hamilton, owner, presented the renovation proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Renovation is to gain a layout that is a better fit for an active family.
- A portion of the front wall will be bumped out and an exterior access door added.
- Materials and colours will match the existing house, new skylights introduced.
- Exterior lighting is not needed as the garage has existing pot lights.

Panel Comments

Panel members commented this was a minor renovation, but noted a possible drafting error about raising the second storey roof height by 3-5 inches that should be resolved.

G. Hamilton, owner, noted there are no changes to the roof, except new skylights.

In summary, the Panel members suggested the existing roof line remain unbroken, and approve of the proposal so long as the expansion fits entirely within the existing roofline, behind the existing fascia board.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Very minor change to existing house and landscape is acceptable
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	Negligible
7. Overlook and privacy issues	None
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	Acceptable
2. Roofscape	Acceptable changes (skylights), roof height discrepancy on drawings to be confirmed.
3. Flashing	N/A
4. Lighting	No change
5. Garages and outbuildings	N/A

Landscaping

1. Fencing and screening	No change to existing
2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	No change to existing
3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	No change to existing
4. Play and recreation areas	No change to existing
5. Hard landscaping	No change to existing
6. Parking and driveways	No change to existing

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00072.

The motion carried.
None opposed.

c) 2017 Allan Cassidy Awards

- Nomination Process
- Selection Process

G. Buffett gave a summary of the upcoming awards. Some of the comments were:

- Design award is to celebrate good urban design including residential, commercial or institutional developments.
- Recognize notable new buildings or renovations that enhance streetscape or neighbourhoods.
- Projects must have been completed between 2013 and 2016, with up to four awards to be presented.

Panel members noted the Oak Bay Community Association has posted information about the Allan Cassidy awards on their website.

D. Jensen commented that an upcoming news article and advertisements in the Oak Bay News would promote people submitting nominations, and signage could be posted at Municipal Hall. Photos of past award winning buildings will be made available, and nominations can be considered at the September ADP meeting.

J. Armitage departed the meeting at 10:30 am.

5. Information Items

None

6. Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Tuesday, September 5, 2017.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 am.