



**MINUTES**  
**OAK BAY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL**  
**TUESDAY, MARCH 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 8:46 am.

**2. Adoption of Minutes from February 7, 2017**

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes from February 7, 2017 be adopted as amended.  
The motion was carried.  
None opposed.

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

**4. Information Items**

D. Jensen noted that interior floor plans cannot be distributed due to privacy issues, as confirmed by legal counsel. However, the District will be including a voluntary waiver on the development application form asking applicants if they are willing to release this information for review; if the applicant is agreeable, the interior floor plans will be distributed to the Advisory Design Panel for review.

D. Jensen departed the meeting at 8:55 am.

**5. Old Business**

- a) 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:

- The front porch railing has been modified to 3.5” square pillars on the railing.
- Window trim is modified to a more traditional style, consistent across all elevations.
- Window colour has been changed to black.
- Roof is extended over the garage doors to join the roof on each side.

### **Panel Comments**

Panel members noted the mid floor band recommended for removal at the previous Panel meeting is still showing in the current rendering and again recommended its removal for a more consistent façade; and inquired regarding window materials, recommending vinyl clad over wood as mullions are thinner than vinyl windows.

T. Rados, applicant, agreed to remove the mid floor band and advised they are proposing aluminum clad windows to provide reinforcement without wide mullions.

Panel members inquired about the proposed door and soffit materials, and reiterated the current fascia band is a confusing expression of the house as the house has enough basic proportion and scale to survive better without it, although it would remain on the front porch. A Panel member also suggested the applicant view the balcony pickets on the front porch of 2031 Runnymede Avenue, to get ideas of how to treat the porch as a horizontal extension of the house.

T. Rados, applicant, noted an inconsistency in soffit material, agreed to using stucco soffits, and advised front door is stained fibreglass with glass inlay and wrought iron detail.

In summary, the Panel members noted the following:

- Remove the mid height fascia and stucco soffits to remain.
- More strength in bottom and balcony detailing suggested (eg 2031 Runnymede Ave).
- Rainwater leaders colour to blend into the body colour of the house.
- Should be full height pilasters with cap at the roof line.

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

#### **Siting of Buildings**

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| 1. Maintenance of residential park setting                  | Achieved    |
| 2. Setbacks   | Acceptable  |
| 3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area | Acceptable  |
| 4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development                | Appropriate |
| 5. Relationship to adjacent buildings                       | Appropriate |
| 6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties              | No issue    |
| 7. Overlook and privacy issues                              | Addressed   |
| 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 |
| 3. Flashing  | Acceptable |
| 4. Lighting  | Acceptable |
| 5. Garages and outbuildings  | N/A        |

#### **Landscaping**

|   |                               |
|---|-------------------------------|
| 1. Fencing and screening  | Appropriate                   |
| 2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material | Generally well handled.       |
| 3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation                      | Replacement trees acceptable. |
| 4. Play and recreation areas                                    | Rear yard achieves these.     |
| 5. Hard landscaping   | Appropriate                   |
| 6. Parking and driveways  | Good                          |

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00059.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

- b) 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 revised proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Basement and garage pushed back about one metre under house to save trees.
- Driveway moved to save trees on the side, only removing trees in building footprint.
- The top two floors have been pulled forward approximately 1.2 metres to assist in setting the patio in the back and save more trees.
- Front entry reconfigured to make front door more prominent, windows added to façade.

### **Panel Comments**

Panel members commented that more trees could be saved, and that detailed drawings need to be resolved as specific construction details may change proportions of the design.

T. Martin, applicant, noted he has consulted with the municipal arborist and tree 922 will be saved and monitored during excavation, and that the house has a full basement set back one metre in order to save root structure.

Panel members commented they were pleased that fencing has been removed, noting some fencing could be retained in the rear yard for privacy. The Panel noted the overall massing was good but details need to be confirmed. In summary the Panel had the following recommendations:

- Concern with use of white stucco and how it impacts north neighbour.
- More detailed information needed, including 1:5 building section and control joints.
- Front elevation is improved, rear elevation well handled, continue to protect oak 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.

## **6. New Business**

- a) ADP00060 – 390 Beach Drive – Subdivision - Siting and Design  
To permit construction of a single family home.

J.Boisvert and D. Gray, applicants, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Contemporary design to be built with concrete tilt up sandwich panels.
- Mostly concrete and glass with white flashing design.
- No stucco detail, and no bellyband as exterior cladding is a 2" concrete structure.
- Concrete panels are 13 feet wide with mitred corners.

### **Panel Comments**

Panel members commented that the roof was unresolved and inquired about soffit materials and exterior lighting, noting the applicant should follow dark sky principles as this is an important wildlife area.

J. Boisvert, applicant, noted the roof is a challenge as it has been overheight, and confirmed the soffit is pearlescent aluminum clad and that recessed down lights will be put into soffits to minimize light pollution.

G. Buffet commented that the building was at maximum height and that a restrictive covenant on the property is to account for tsunami and flood risk.

J. Boisvert confirmed that windows will be triple glazed with clear glass that is switchable opaque, and noted the compact design has preserved a good view corridor for the house behind.

Panel members suggested a small canopy be added to the front entrance for shelter, and that doors be put on the front face of the building and not on the side.

In summary, the Panel members noted the following:

- Entrance way still needs to be resolved.
- Further refinement of the roof detail still need to be worked out, with the potential to consider a height variance.

It was moved and seconded that ADP00060 be tabled to a subsequent meeting of the Advisory Design Panel.

The motion was carried.  
None opposed.

W. King left the meeting at 10:35 am.

- b) ADP00066 – 3188 Wessex Close – Siting and Design  
To permit renovations to an existing single family home.

M. Moody, applicant, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Add a new formal entry to the front of the house with skylights to provide light.
- Addition to the rear of the house for outdoor dining and entertaining that will provide shelter from the rain with a simple flat roof line punctuated with skylights.
- White vinyl windows with patterned muntins.
- Classic style to include wood columns, wood picket guardrails, and grey stucco.

### ***Panel Comments***

Panel members commented that the proposal was well thought out and a nice refreshment of the home, suggested that corner boards could be larger than the 3"x3" proposed, and that significant exterior lighting was proposed and the applicant should be mindful of dark sky principles, noting wall lights for the garage and recessed lights under the front porch are all that is needed. Panel members also recommended skylights on the front elevations be changed to flat skylights, and that detailing on the front columns be calmed.

M Moody, applicant, agreed to eliminate the exterior LED puck lighting in the dormers and accommodate other lighting suggestions, and to revise front elevation skylights from dormer to flat.

### Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

#### Siting of Buildings

|   |                                |
|---|--------------------------------|
| 1. Maintenance of residential park setting                  | N/A (not Uplands)              |
| 2. Setbacks   | Existing – no change           |
| 3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area | Overall improvement is welcome |
| 4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development                | Good                           |
| 5. Relationship to adjacent buildings                       | Good                           |
| 6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties              | No change to existing          |
| 7. Overlook and privacy issues                              | Well handled                   |
| 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 handled   |
| 2. Roofscape   | Good   |
| 3. Flashing  | Appropriate  |
| 4. Lighting  | Appropriate, conditional on elimination of lights proposed at each dormer and apex of garage façade. |
| 5. Garages and outbuildings  | Attached garage treatment appropriate  |

#### Landscaping

|   |                              |
|---|------------------------------|
| 1. Fencing and screening  | No change                    |
| 2. Native plants and vegetation                                 | No change                    |
| 3. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material | Minimal impact on existing   |
| 4. Play and recreation areas                                    | Existing rear yard improved. |
| 5. Hard landscaping   | Appropriate                  |
| 6. Parking and driveways  | Existing                     |

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00066.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

- c) DVP00058 / ADP00067 – 3125 Uplands Road – Uplands Siting and Design  
To permit renovations to an existing single family home.

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

- Cabana and pool mechanical room have been removed.
- Detached garage is larger, with different siting and roofline, and additional detailing.
- Garage has steeper roof pitch and dormer, but dormer can be reduced.
- A glass roof has been added to the new covered patio.
- Railing on porte cochere is changing, going back to original detail.

#### Panel Comments

Panel members commented that garage height could be reduced to reflect main house character and provide more context from the original building, that patio brick needs to be fatter or not use brick if long slender look is desired, and noted covered patio with glass roof is a good enhancement.

R. Collins, applicant agreed to use wood instead of brick.

Panel members suggested lowering the roof line and removing the north elevation dormer on the detached garage, eliminating the gable end eave return and cupola, and painting shingles a brick colour. Panel members commented that the variances are supportable.

I. Gallant, applicant, gave a brief summary of the proposed landscape design. Some of the comments were:

- Maintain existing columns on west side and maintain same footprint of the driveway, but it will widen as it nears the house and garage.
- Driveway will be pavers banded with concrete.
- Cedars will be replaced with a broad leaf evergreen and three Japanese maples along the front of the property.
- Surface around pool will be poured concrete and pond will be noise buffer for street.
- One cedar tree, two pine trees and one deteriorating oak tree will be removed, southwest side of the pool will have added turf.
- Black interior chain link fence with laurel hedge planted in front of it for pool security.

Panel members expressed concern that there was excessive paving.

I. Gallant agreed to reduce driveway paving on the approach to the garage and the west side of the garage.

#### Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

##### Siting of Buildings

|    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | Maintenance of residential park setting                  | Generally unchanged  |
| 2. | Setbacks   | Acceptable   |
| 3. | Relationship of character / massing to image of the area | Appropriate and well-handled revisions to the main house         |
| 4. | Impact on scale and rhythm of development                | Good   |
| 5. | Relationship to adjacent buildings                       | Good   |
| 6. | Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties              | N/A  |
| 7. | Overlook and privacy issues                              | N/A  |
| 8. | Transition between private and public space              | Well handled   |
| 9. | Accessory buildings                                      | Refer to panel recommendations to simplify design of new garage. |

##### Design of Buildings

|    |   |                                 |
|----|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. | General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing | Minimal change to existing.     |
| 2. | Roofscape   | Good                            |
| 3. | Flashing  | Good                            |
| 4. | Lighting  | Dark sky principles apply       |
| 5. | Garages and outbuildings  | Refer to panel recommendations. |

##### Landscaping

|    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | Fencing and screening  | Excellent  |
| 2. | Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material | Generally good   |
| 3. | Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation                      | Well considered revisions.   |
| 4. | Play and recreation areas                                    | Good   |
| 5. | Hard landscaping   | Generally good, some minor revisions to driveway extent recommended. |
| 6. | Parking and driveways  | Generally good, some minor revisions to driveway extent recommended. |

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve DVP00058/ADP00067.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

**7. Next Meeting**

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Tuesday, April 4, 2017.

**8. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:35 am.