AGENDA
OAK BAY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL
TO BE HELD TUESDAY, JUNE 4, 2019 AT 8:45 AM COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MUNICIPAL HALL, 2167 OAK BAY AVENUE

1. Call to Order
2. Adoption of Minutes from April 30, 2019
3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items
4. Old Business
a) ADP00106-3033 Devon Road

To permit construction of a single family home.
5. New Business
a) ADP00110 - 3055 Valdez Place

To permit renovations to a single family home.
6. Information Items
7. Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of the ADP is scheduled for Tuesday, July 2, 2019.
8. Adjournment

OAK BAY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL
TUESDAY, APRIL 30, 2019 AT 8:45 AM COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MUNICIPAL HALL, 2167 OAK BAY AVENUE

## MEMBERS PRESENT

John Armitage
Will King

David Wilkinson
Dominic Yu

MEMBERS ABSENT
Cairine Green
Kim Milburn

## STAFF PRESENT

Bruce Anderson, Director of Building and Planning Graeme Buffett, Planner

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8:47 am.
2. Adoption of Minutes from March 5, 2019.

It was moved and seconded that the minutes from March 5, 2019 be adopted.
The motion was carried. None opposed.

## 3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items

It was moved and seconded that the agenda for April 30, 2019 be approved.
The motion was carried. None opposed.

## 4. Old Business

None.

## 5. New Business

a) ADP00103 / DVP00087 - 3125 Weald Road

To permit renovations to a single family home.
G. Buffett provided an overview of the application. Some of the comments were:

- Proposed work includes building a new deck, and rebuilding and extending the garage similar to the existing footprint.
- Variances are requested to relax the front, interior side and total side lot line setbacks as both the garage and rear deck encroach into the setbacks.
- Existing garage is difficult to access due to the porte cochere siting.
- Siting of existing house has created a situation where one of the proposed decks located at the rear of the property encroaches into the front setback.
- Proposal follows OCP policy of maintaining existing siting and of fostering new buildings within existing footprint.
- Concerns were relayed to applicant about inconsistent roof design between the house and proposed garage, and the applicant has elected to continue with the peaked roof design for the garage.
A. Bisson, applicant, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:
- New deck in rear yard will replace the existing, and the garage will be expanded to provide more functional space and storage, utilizing a preferred gable roof.
- An attached garage is preferred as it is more cost effective to reuse the existing building and footprint and does not disturb any trees.
- Client driven design includes gable roof, deck railings and guards.


## Panel Comments

Panel comments included the following:

- Consider an alternate location for the garage if current location is not adequate.
- Stricter code requirements must be met for extending the garage closer to the lot line.
- Garage treatment is incompatible with house style; suggest submissive style where garage is subservient to house and has a relationship with the retained porte cochere.
- Consider maintaining existing flat roofline, continue with a neutral design.
- Be mindful of dark sky principles, ensure lighting is angled downward.
- Consider reducing proposed deck size to avoid requiring a variance.
- Confirmed aluminum soffit treatment will be installed underneath the deck.
- West elevation is visible from the street and is an important piece of the composition; design should be appropriate for such visibility.
- Consider retaining the existing garage and construct a single detached garage at the front corner of the property.

In summary, the Panel members noted the following:

- Utilize a calm, consistent design that complements the existing house.
- Consider a less competing, more simplistic style compatible to the house design.
- Explore deck railing details that enhance house symmetry (white railings, not glass).

It was moved and seconded to recommend that ADP00103/ DVP00087 be tabled to a subsequent meeting of the Advisory Design Panel.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.
b) ADP00106 - 3033 Devon Road

To permit construction of a single family home.
G. Buffett provided an overview of the application. Some of the comments were:

- Proposing a traditional design home utilizing stucco cladding with open gables and a covered entryway; second storey will be stepped back from the street.
- New home will replace a single storey house with similar front setback; side setbacks will increase; house will be built further back than existing.
- Most existing homes on street are single storey homes.

Lindsay Baker, applicant, and David Guan, owner, presented the application. Some of the comments were:

- Proposing a French contemporary style meeting Step 3 of the BC Energy Step Code.
- Larger setback allows additional trees to be planted for a parklike setting.
- Side yard setback proposed at 6 metres; setbacks are not maximized.
- Proposed sloping hip roof permits stepping back the upper floor to minimize massing and avoid shading the neighbouring properties.


## Panel Comments

Panel comments included the following:

- Confirmed no fencing proposed for front of the property.
- Plans do not specify stucco for wall type details.
- Be mindful of dark sky principles, ensure lighting is angled downward.
- Applaud the targeted extra energy performance.
- Consider the treatment of the top of the foundation wall; treat it in a deliberate way.
- Suggest reducing driveway width at boulevard then flare out on private property.
- Create visual connection to front door from the yard (ie. stepping stone pathway plantings).
- Windows will be set in and wrapped in stucco; consider detailing around windows.
- Express more horizontality for further articulation and development of the massing to better fit into the neighbourhood.
- Streetscape elevation is most important; emphasize front entryway, look for cohesion from surrounding properties, pay attention to simple details and quality design.
- Simplify rooflines, consider hip roofs throughout, de-emphasize garage height, lower the gable overtop the second floor, consider soffit details.
- Add planting to both sides of entryway, blend landscape into existing neighbourhood.
- Avoid awkward bump out (closet) that affects the front building face.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that ADP00106 be tabled to a subsequent meeting of the Advisory Design Panel.

The motion was carried. None opposed.
c) ADP00107-2785 Dorset Road

To permit renovations to the front elevation of a single family home.
G. Buffett provided an overview of the application. Some of the comments were:

- Previous application was approved by Council September 2018, work is underway.
- Challenged with a front entry element, particularly water run-off and moisture issues; would like to revert to the original design with no gable over the entry.
- Primary change is a sloped, covered entryway.
M. Ludwig, and B. Kurylo, applicant, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:
- Proposal is to revert to original arched timber detail; gable entry is mechanically awkward space where water and vermin issues could be problematic.
- Clients appreciate the entryway and space it provides, and how it ties into the new living room roof and follows the slope of the existing gable.
- Applicant wants to incorporate a broader belly band to break up the east elevation.


## Panel Comments

Panel comments included the following:

- Projection of approximately 3 feet is adequate, belly band is unnecessary element.
- Consider alternative skylight over front entry to avoid 'plastic bubble' appearance, with double smaller skylights preferable.
- Panel reiterated its July 2018 suggestion that the two posts from the existing landing be moved forward; create a suitable pitched roof as an extension of the existing plane.


## Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

| Siting of Buildings |  | ok |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1. | Maintenance of residential park setting | ok |
| 2. | Setbacks | Relationship of character / massing to image of the area |
| ok |  |  |
| 4. | Impact on scale and rhythm of development | ok |
| 5. | Relationship to adjacent buildings | ok |
| 6. | Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties | ok |
| 7. | Overlook and privacy issues | ok |
| 8. | Transition between private and public space | Improved |
| 9. | Accessory buildings | n/a |
| Design of Buildings |  |  |
| 1. | General massing, proportion and overall articulation of |  |
| building in relation to established housing | ok |  |
| 2. | Roofscape | ok |
| 3. | Flashing | ok |
| 4. | Lighting | ok |
| 5. | Garages and outbuildings | n/a |
| Landscaping |  |  |
| 1. | Fencing and screening | ok |
| 2. | Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material | ok |
| 3. | Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation | ok |
| 4. | Play and recreation areas | ok |
| 5. | Hard landscaping | ok |
| 6. | Parking and driveways | ok |

It was moved and seconded to recommend that ADP00107 be approved.
The motion was carried.
None opposed.
d) ADP00109 / DVP00092 - 2725 Lincoln Road

To permit renovations to the front and rear elevation of a single family home.
G. Buffett provided an overview of the application. Some of the comments were:

- Proposal includes construction of a rear deck, changes to window, door and garage openings, and front entryway.
- Proposed deck provides direct access to the rear yard from the main living area and replaces an existing paved area.
- A variance is requested to reduce the required separation between the new deck and an existing in ground swimming pool located at the rear of the property.
D. Makaroff, applicant, and B. Hougaard, owner, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:
- New energy efficient windows will replace existing single pane windows.
- Deck is less than 3.0 metres from the edge of the pool, which needs a variance.


## Panel Comments

Panel comments included the following:

- Muntin bars are an unnecessary window element and can be deleted.
- Consider a larger deck design to include a sitting area.
- Garage door detailing is interesting.
- Be mindful of dark sky principles, ensure lighting is angled downward in soffits.
- Confirmed that the stucco will be repaired, patched and repainted after new windows are installed; existing visual details around windows will be maintained and matched.
- Confirmed that the front entry is fully concrete and consistent with the housing style.
- Variance request is reasonable.

| Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Siting of Buildings |  | No issues |
| 1. | Maintenance of residential park setting | No issues |
| 2. | Setbacks | Retained. Unchanged. |
| 3. | Relationship of character / massing to image of the area | None. |
| 4. | Impact on scale and rhythm of development | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 5. | Relationship to adjacent buildings | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 6. | Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties | None noted. |
| 7. | Overlook and privacy issues | Improved. |
| 8. | Transition between private and public space | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 9. | Accessory buildings |  |
| Design of Buildings |  |  |
| 1. | General massing, proportion and overall articulation of |  |
| building in relation to established housing |  | Unchanged. |
| 2. | Roofscape | Unchanged. |
| 3. | Flashing | n/a |
| 4. | Lighting | Dark sky principles please |
| 5. | Garages and outbuildings | Unaltered. |
| Landscaping |  |  |
| 1. | Fencing and screening | No change. |
| 2. | Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material | Well managed. |
| 3. | Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation | Unaltered. |
| 4. | Play and recreation areas | Unaltered. |
| 5. | Hard landscaping | Unaltered. |
| 6. | Parking and driveways | Unaltered. |

It was moved and seconded to recommend that ADP00102 / DVP00092 be approved. The motion was carried. None opposed.
e) ADP00111 - 3565 Upper Terrace Road

To permit renovations to the rear elevation of a single family home.
G. Buffett provided an overview of the application. Some of the comments were:

- Proposal is for a deck addition on the east side of the home, where deck is set back significantly from the street and consistent with main floor height.
- Deck is sited on the Midland Road elevation, existing trees are not impacted.
- Materials include glass guards with aluminum railings and vinyl decking.
L. Kors, applicant, presented the application. Some of the comments were:
- Proposed deck is an extension of the existing deck, colours and materials will match the existing condition.
- Existing front decks are small and unusable, the sloping rear yard does not provide usable yard space; deck provides direct access from the yard to the main floor.
- Rear siting will minimize visual impact on streetscape; extension is well below existing roofline, which also mitigates impact on neighbouring properties.
- Two new large canopy trees will be added to the property.


## Panel Comments

Panel comments included the following:

- Adhere to Dark Sky principles for any exterior lighting.
- Ensure soffits beneath deck are finished to match the existing deck.
- Consider cutting light wells or skylights into the deck to permit additional light into the windows below, or create a connection or a step down from the deck to the lower area to permit additional lighting into the house below.
- Consider a stronger cap rail be installed onto the new portion of the deck.
- Railings should be consistent with those adjacent to them.

In summary, the Panel members suggested the following:

- Ensure soffits beneath deck are finished.
- Be mindful of dark sky principles, ensure lighting is angled downward.
- Materials to be consistent throughout.

| Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Siting of Buildings |  |
| 1. Maintenance of residential park setting | Ok. |
| 2. Setbacks | No variance. |
| 3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area | Appropriate. |
| 4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development | None. |
| 5. Relationship to adjacent buildings | None. |
| 6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties | None. |
| 7. Overlook and privacy issues | None. |
| 8. Transition between private and public space | None. |
| 9. Accessory buildings | n/a |
| Design of Buildings |  |
| 1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing | Strong effect of projecting deck when viewed from below. |
| 2. Roofscape | Soffit treatment to underside of. |
| 3. Flashing | Wrap vinyl deck onto fascia. |
| 4. Lighting | n/a |
| 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 | n/a |
| 6. Parking and driveways | n/a |

It was moved and seconded to recommend that ADP00111 be approved.
The motion was approved. None opposed.
f) DP000026 - 1476 Beach Drive

To permit replacement of balcony railings on a multifamily residential building.
G. Buffett provided an overview of the application. Some of the comments were:

- Exterior alterations proposed for existing building, update will affect street elevation.
- Proposed work updates the exterior balcony by replacing corroded wrought iron railing with glass guards and aluminum posts and caps; end walls will match and blend with the exterior side elevations and existing building.
R. Egli and B. Mursell, applicants, presented the application. Some of the comments were:
- Railing height of existing balcony guards are nonconforming and need replacing.
- Propose simple design to best suit the building.
- Framed custom welded aluminum sections with pony walls on the ends.
- Railing will be custom made; intent is not to cheapen the building.


## Panel Comments

Panel comments included the following:

- Concerned with replacing something unique with something with less character.
- Not enough detailing for rails or end panels provided; proposal is underwhelming.
- Consider corner details (ie. metal corners for outside corners), solid looking design, soffit material, end screens are important.
- Consider a modular system.
- Angularity works with the end panels that run full height, providing a sense of enclosure, end walls should not be competing (not stucco).
- Express 16 inch returns as fins.
- Consider overlaying balustrades like the existing, break it up with posts in between, similar to the original rendering.
- Consider additional variation, proposal detracts and has no rhythm, refinement needed.
- Consider maintaining existing railing.
- Consider a hybrid fabrication that provides wind screen and appropriate height.
- Confirmed the vinyl decking will be replaced.

In summary, the Panel members suggested the following:

- Comprehensive, consistent railing system only.
- Delete end pony walls.
- Use full height posts at ends to accommodate full height screens where desired.
- Consider replacing clear glass with opaque or coloured glass, and incorporate perforated metal pickets.
- Must be a consistent organizing modular system.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that DP000026 be tabled to a subsequent meeting of the Advisory Design Panel.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.
g) Committee Review Process - Advisory Design Panel

None.

## 6. Information Items

None.

## 7. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Tuesday, June 7, 2019.

## 8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm.

Uplands

H22. Use the following list to clarify and provide support to the Uplands design guidelines in order to ensure that new or renovated houses are consistent with the design intent of Uplands:

- Respect and abide by the combination of sensitive siting, design and use of materials that creates a sense of harmony and neighbourliness in Uplands. This includes individual design solutions; significant landscaped areas between home, neighbour and street; and outdoor spaces with their own design and character.
- Use high quality materials that have a sense of timelessness, substantial structural qualities, an authentic appearance, qualities of workmanship or craft, and qualities of appropriateness or compatibility.
- Provide adequate vehicular circulation and parking areas on site screened from the street with landscape, walls and other enclosures, using narrow landscaped driveways, with parking structures sensitively sited, visually unobtrusive and complementary with the architecture of the house.
- Site new development as much as possible within the existing development footprint, with front yard setbacks consistent with other houses on the street, retaining as many mature trees and existing vegetation as possible, respecting adjacent private outdoor use areas, with massing comparable in scale and massing with other buildings on the street and partially screened from direct view from the street.
- Design the landscape to reflect the character of the neighbourhood including Garry Oaks and other large trees, enclosure of outdoor spaces with plants, screening, and layering of plants and features.
- Design the space leading to the main entrance of the house as a special landscaped space providing a transition from street to home.

H23. Consider revisions to the maximum lot coverage in Uplands.


Photo Credit: Hope Burns

## Historical Context

The Uplands was planned in 1907-08 for the Winnipeg developer William Gardner by John Charles Olmsted who considered it the finest suburban work of his forty-five year career Olmsted headed the Boston-based Olmsted Brothers, America's leading firm of landscape architects and town planners through the late-19th and early- $20 t b$ centuries.

The Uplands was developed as a residential park to maintain the natural beauty and picturesque setting of a unique suburban landscape. This was achieved through the careful siting of houses, all set against a framework of curving streets and large lots to take full advantage of ocean and mountain views. A system of deed restrictions was introduced to maintain single-family land use and establish minimum standards of value, height, and setbacks. In fact, this system formed the basis of Oak Bay's initial and subsequent zoning by-laws from the 1920s to the '70s.

The special character of the Uplands has been further protected by provincial statute and municipal by-laws, especially the Oak Bay Special Powers Act (1935). Although modified through time, the intent of the Act remains in effect, $i$ e. to protect the park-like design and development standards first established by John Charles Olmsted, and to sustain the environmental integrity of the municipality.

The design guidelines outlined in this brochure are intended to preserve the original vision and character of the Uplands.

## Design Considerations and the <br> Review Process for the Uplands

The following elements of design will be considered by the Oak Bay Advisory Design Panel when reviewing proposed buildings or additions and alterations to existing buildings in the Uplands.


## Goals

The Advisory Design Panel will assess all applications within the context of the Uplands Regulations Bylaw and the Oak Bay Zoning Bylaw to achieve the following goals:

- To maintain and reinforce a residential park atmosphere.
- To ensure the sensitivity of new development to existing dwellings and landscape features.
- To promote design excellence through the approval process for building permits in the Uplands.


## Siting of Buildings

The Advisory Design Panel will consider the following criteria when assessing the siting of buildings within the Uplands:

- Maintenance of the residential park setting Jobn Charles Olmsted, when designing the Uplands, intended to acbieve a residential park atmosphere. This concept shall be maintained.
- Impact on views

The impact on the view corridors of neighbouring properties and public areas should be kept to a minimum.

- Setbacks

Setbacks shall promote and reinforce the residential park atmosphere.

- Relationship in character and massing to the image of the area
- Impact on scale and rhythm of development Scale and rhythm are established by various design elements which include: building beight, building form, roof shape, massing, landscaping, and garages and out-buildings.
- Relationship to adjacent buildings
- Effect of shadows on neighbouring properties
- Overlook and privacy issues
- Transition between private and public space
- Accessory buildings

Accessory buildings shall be assessed by applying the same criteria used for the principal buildings.

## Design of Buildings

New development will be assessed in accordance with the original design guidelines of the Uplands which state that each dwelling shall be distinct in appearance and design from dwellings within a distance of 500 feet. The Advisory Design Panel will consider the following design criteria when assessing proposals:

- General massing, proportion, and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing
- Roofscape

Design of roofs including pitch, form, gables, and dormers.

- Facade articulation and building entry Exterior materials, finishes, glazing, and ornamentation should appear as integral parts of a building and should be sympathetic to the overall design concept.
- Garages and outbuildings



## Advisory Design Panel

## Memorandum

To: Advisory Design Panel

From: Graeme Buffett
Re: 3033 Devon Road

Hello Design Panel Members

At the April 30, 2019 meeting of the Advisory Design Panel, the Panel reviewed an application for a new single family dwelling at 3033 Devon Road. The new home would be designed in a traditional style with stucco cladding, and a covered entryway. The new home would replace a single storey home with a similar front setback, and side setbacks would be increased from the existing siting. The proposed home will extend further back than the existing dwelling, however the required rear yard setback will not be exceeded.

In response to comments from the Panel the applicant revised plans by simplifying the rooflines, eliminating garage entry gables in favour of a hip roof. The front entry gable is retained in order to emphasize the street facing entrance. Plantings have been added to the front yard, the driveway width has been reduced, and a bump out on the south elevation has been eliminated.

The proposal should be considered in context of the Uplands guidelines as supported by the Oak Bay Official Community Plan (OCP) policies. A review of the application as it pertains to the OCP policies and Uplands guidelines results in the following:

OCP Policies

- Use high quality materials that have a sense of timelessness. The design uses a simple stucco clad exterior with a primarily hip roof. A street facing gable defines the front entryway.
- Provide adequate vehicular circulation and parking areas on site screened from the street with landscape, walls and other enclosures, using narrow landscaped driveways, with parking structures sited, visually unobtrusive and complementary with the architecture of the house.

The proposed garage is street facing, common to homes in the neighbourhood. Entry gables have been eliminated in order to de-emphasize the appearance of the garage. The attached garage is consistent with the architecture of the home. The driveway, surfaced with permeable Roman pavers, is narrow at the front lot line and widens as it nears the garage entry.

- Site new development as much as possible within the existing development footprint. The proposal will be sited partially within the existing building footprint with an expansion into the rear yard.
- Design landscape to reflect the character of the neighbourhood. New canopy trees located in the side and rear yards are proposed to meet the 45\% canopy cover target established by the Oak Bay Urban Forest Strategy. The neighbourhood generally consists of front yards landscaped with small and medium sized trees and open lawns with no sidewalk.
- Design the space leading to the main entrance of the house as a special landscaped space providing a transition from street to home. The pedestrian walkway consists of Roman pavers with links to the driveway. A planting bed borders the walkway.


## Siting of Buildings

- Maintenance of the residential park setting. The proposal would maintain the front yard area facing Devon Road and would increase the side yard setbacks. A plum tree that is not protected by bylaw will be removed from the front yard. A bylaw protected Sitka spruce would also be removed from the site, which will require two replacement trees. Paved surface within the front lot line setback is below the maximum $25 \%$ permitted by the Zoning Bylaw. The proposal does not include any fencing or gates along the street frontage.
- Impact on views. The subject site is near the intersection of Devon Road and Dover Road. All maximum heights are adhered to and it is not anticipated that the proposed siting will negatively impact view corridors.
- Setbacks. All setbacks are adhered to and side yard setbacks will be increased, which promotes and reinforces the residential park atmosphere.
- Relationship in character and massing to the image of the area and impact on scale and rhythm of development. The immediate neighbourhood is characterized by single storey homes along Devon Road and a mix of one and two storey homes to the rear of the subject
site along Midland Road. The massing will be more substantial than the existing home, however, the proposal does not exceed limits established by the Zoning Bylaw.
- Relationship to adjacent buildings. The proposal would increase separation between the homes on the north and south sides of the subject property.
- Effect of shadows on neighbouring properties. As a two storey dwelling located in the centre of the subject property there is no immediate concern for shadowing.
- Overlook and privacy issues. In order to mitigate the effect of the proposal on adjacent properties new plantings are proposed and some existing plantings will be retained.
- Transition between private and public space. There are no proposed visual barriers between the adjacent streets and the home. A covered entryway clearly defines the front entrance of the home and provides a transition between the private and public realms.
- Accessory buildings. No accessory buildings are proposed.

Design of Buildings

- General massing, proportion, and overall articulation of building to established housing. As the proposal would replace a single storey dwelling with a two storey dwelling there will be an increase to the building mass on the site. However, the application is compliant with all of the requirements established in the Zoning Bylaw and is utilizing a portion of the existing building footprint. The second storey is stepped back from the lower level in order to minimize the impact on the single storey streetscape.
- Roofscape. The roofscape consists of a hipped roof with one gable at the front entrance.
- Façade articulation and building entry. The main entry is defined by a covered entrance.
- Garages and outbuildings. An attached garage provides covered parking. No detached buildings are proposed.

If you have any questions regarding the above, please feel free to contact me at gbuffett@oakbay.ca.

Yours truly,

Graeme Buffett
Planner
District of Oak Bay

# Memo 

To: Graeme Buffet, Building and Planning<br>From: Chris Paul, Municipal Arborist<br>Date: $\quad$ March 20, 2019<br>Subject: 3033 Devon Road ADP

A Tree Preservation plan has been submitted for this property with an inventory and locations marked for tree protection fencing. There are a number of bylaw protected trees listed on the property, some are good specimens and some are not.

The only bylaw protected tree shown as to be removed is the 72 cm dbh Sitka Spruce. This tree is very surface rooted, there are roots above the surface up to 5 meters away from the trunk in the direction of the proposed house. This is not a species that tolerates surface disruption in general and many of these large roots will have to be removed during the excavation for the proposed house. It can be removed under section 6 (4) and two replacements will be required.

The other three trees shown as to be removed are all poor specimens and unprotected and can be removed. There are two groups of Laurel stems along the back fence that are over mature and are in poor shape. These trees are really intended to be hedges and they have been unmaintained and have grown into trees. These are not good trees to retain in their present form for the long term. I would issue removal permits for both laurel without requiring replacements. The Birch tree in the front yard was originally in a group of three trees. The other two stems were dying from a Bronze Birch Borer (BBB) infestation and were removed. The remaining tree is showing signs of die back at the top, typical of a BBB infestation. Once infested these trees usually only last about 5 years. A permit could be issued for removal of this tree under section 6 (9) which would require one replacement tree. Removing these trees will give space for new trees. There will be a requirement to replant two new trees to replace the Spruce and one to replace the Birch. In a new landscape these trees listed above should be removed and replaced with new trees that will provide a better future canopy cover.

As mentioned in the report the Ash \# 982 will require some pruning for clearance for the proposed house. The Cedar tree \# 985 is a healthy tree and is shown to be retained and protected. Hawthorn \# 983 in the corner of the lot could be retained with some good pruning. This tree, the Cedar and the Ash are the only good trees in the yard and the only trees that should be included in canopy cover estimates.

I have not seen any future landscape plan so I can not include any future canopy cover. The canopy cover provided by the three trees I considered retainable is currently $15 \%$ with approximately 155 square meters. There are currently no boulevard trees in front of this property. Boulevard trees planted after construction may add to canopy cover in the future.

Tree protection fencing will have to be inspected before demolition starts. Please call the Parks Department for inspection at 250-592-7275.

## DISTRICT OF <br> OAK*BAY

## ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL Materials and Colours Checklist

## GENERAL

This form MUST BE COMPLETED and submitted with your package for the Advisory Design Panel.
Property Address 3033 Deon Rd.

Date April 4/19

## MATERIALS AND COLOURS

ITEM
windows
Windows
DOORS
Exterior Doors
Garage Doors
Accessory Building
TRIM
Doors
Windows
ROOF
Roofing
Flashing
Fascia
Soffit
SIDING
Exterior Cladding
Stone / Rock Cladding
HARD SURFACES
Driveway
Walkway
Patio
FENCE
Fencing
LIGHTING
Exterior
Landscape

MATERIALS

Metal

Stained wood

| $" \mathrm{Na}$ " |
| :--- |

Head Hashing
Head Flashing


Wood
Aluminum

$\qquad$


| Roman |  | Paves |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | conc | $" 1$ | $n$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $n$ | $n$ |

$\qquad$


ATTACH SAMPLES TO REVERSE SIDE

## Materials and Colours Checklist



Stained wood front entry


Black asphalt 30 year shingles


Black painted 2" $\times 8$ " fasica board

Black metal framed windows


White acrylic stucco siding

Roman pavers with concrete boarder



Key Plan
$\qquad$ - denotes Barrier Fencing

Site Plan
1:100

|  | Lot 13 , Block 46, Section 31, Victoria District, Plan 10950, PID 005155851 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lot information | reaurin | Proposed |
| Zone |  | Re. 2 m |
| Lot fronage |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Lot Depth |  | 42.08 |
| ${ }^{\text {Premer }}$ | 25\% | ${ }_{6}^{25.28 \mathrm{~m} 2} \mathbf{2 4 . 3}$ |
| Rear Y Yard Setback Area |  |  |
| Seaved Surface ( (m2 and \%) |  | 0 m 2 |
| Sforontot Line | 10.66 | 10.66 |
| Interios Sidideot Line (Noth) | 3.0 | ${ }_{\text {c }}^{3.0} 1$ |
|  | 3.0 6.0 | ${ }_{9.11}^{6.11}$ |
| Rear Lot Line ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 7.62 | 11.02 |
| Heights |  |  |
| A Average Grade |  |  |
| Buiding Height | ${ }^{7} .32$ | ${ }_{7} 7.14$ |
| Occupababe eeight |  |  |
| Foor frea (Non-basement) |  | 379.86 m2 (4088.75 sq.ffi) |
| Main Flor |  | (193.5 m2 (2083.3 sa.f) |
|  |  |  |
| mper eleck |  | 15.6 m ( 1685 satit) |
|  | 0.4 | ${ }_{0.37}^{48.15 \mathrm{~m} \text { ( } 518.3 \text { satit) }}$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Main Floor |  | 193.55 mm (2083.39 3 9.ff) |
| Upper Floor |  |  |
|  |  | 44.05 2(4).459.7) |
|  |  |  |
| Lower potionint |  |  |
|  | $25 \%$ |  |

, -




Basement 3D plan



Main Floor 3D plan



Upper Floor 3D plan
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Rear Elevation
1:50


Right Side Elevation




Building Section
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Average Grade
Lr - 117
Lower Floor

## Advisory Design Panel

## Memorandum

To: Advisory Design Panel

From: Graeme Buffett
Re: 3055 Valdez Place

Hello Design Panel Members

The June 4, 2019 meeting of the Advisory Design Panel includes a review of proposed renovations to an existing single family dwelling at 3055 Valdez Place. The proposal would expand on the existing home, built in 1979 in a contemporary style featuring unfinished wood cladding. The proposed renovations expand the building footprint on the west side and the rear of the home. The existing vertical cedar siding will be retained with new areas to match. A detailed landscape plan also indicates the existing pool will be retained with new patio space added around it. The application meets the requirements of the District of Oak Bay Zoning Bylaw and no variances are requested.

The proposal should be considered in context of the Uplands guidelines as supported by the Oak Bay Official Community Plan policies. A review of the application as it pertains to the guidelines results in the following:

OCP Policies

- Use high quality materials that have a sense of timelessness. The addition uses a vertical cedar board siding matching the existing home. The asphalt shingle roof will be replaced with a metal roof.
- Provide adequate vehicular circulation and parking areas on site...using narrow landscaped driveways, with parking structures sensitively sited, visually unobtrusive and complementary to the architecture of the house. The proposal widens the existing single car garage by 1.5 m with a design matching the existing home. The driveway is narrowest at the front lot line and widens as it approaches the garage to accommodate two side by side parking spaces in the
driveway. Proposed landscaping adjacent to the driveway softens the hardscaping, which is below the maximum permitted by the District of Oak Bay Zoning Bylaw. The existing asphalt driveway would be replaced and expanded.
- Site new development as much as possible within the existing development footprint. The proposal would add to the existing footprint on the west side and rear of the home.
- Design landscape to reflect the character of the neighbourhood. New canopy trees are proposed to increase the canopy coverage to 48\%. Proposed landscaping in the front yard includes new plantings around the front entry stairs and new plantings adjacent to the driveway.


## Siting of Buildings

- Maintenance of the residential park setting. The proposal adheres to the required setbacks. Seven Garry oak trees are located on the west side of the house. Two Garry oak trees are located in the proposed building footprint and two are in close proximity to the proposed building footprint. The two Garry oak trees in close proximity to the proposed building footprint will require four replacements on the site.
- Impact on views. The addition will be located on the west side of the home and at the rear of the home. The proposed modifications will not impact views.
- Setbacks. All existing setbacks will be met.
- Relationship in character and massing to the image of the area and impact on scale and rhythm of development. The building height, size, and overall massing is in keeping with the scale of adjacent homes established in the neighbourhood.
- Relationship to adjacent buildings. The proposed additions will not substantially change the relationship of the home to adjacent buildings.
- Overlook and privacy issues. There are no concerns with overlook or privacy issues.
- Transition between private and public space. The proposal includes a new front entry stair and associated plantings that will improve the transition between the private and public space.
- Accessory Buildings. A proposed mechanical pool shed is located in the rear yard and will be screened by plantings.

Design of Buildings

- General massing, proportion, and overall articulation of building to established housing. The proposed massing is consistent with adjacent properties.
- Roofscape. Additions will maintain and extend the current roofscape. Materials will be updated from asphalt shingles to a standing seam metal roof.
- Façade articulation and building entry. The main entry is defined by a front entry patio and a materials change from vertical cedar siding to a horizontal wood cladding.

If you have any questions regarding the above, please feel free to contact me at gbuffett@oakbay.ca.

Yours truly,

Graeme Buffett
Planner
District of Oak Bay

# Memo 

To: Graeme Buffet, Building and Planning<br>From: Chris Paul, Municipal Arborist<br>Date: $\quad$ May 17, 2019<br>Subject: 3055 Valdez ADP

There has been a tree protection plan submitted with this application. There is tree protection fencing along the driveway where the majority of the traffic will be. In talking with Rob Spytz there will be some landscaping in the back yard within the root zones of the Garry oaks. Any equipment in this area should be travelling on a road of plywood as the soil can be quite wet and subject to compaction. This tree protection plan will be made part of the building permit conditions. Any excavated material must not be stored in the root zone of the oaks in the front yard or the oaks in the back around the pool.

All the oaks at the side of the house are shown as being removed. \# 519 and \# 517 are in the building footprint and can be removed without replacements. \# 516 will be close enough to the foundation excavation that it should be removed and will require two for one replacement. \# 520 is shown as being in the driveway/parking area. If that parking area is approved the tree would have to be removed and would require two for one replacement. There is a small tree located near the pool that is shown as to be removed. This is not a bylaw protected tree and may be removed.

Trees \# 514, 515 and 518 are all far enough from the foundation that I feel they can be retained. One 4 inch diameter branch may have to be pruned off of tree \# 514 as it will reach low over the proposed house. They have been under concrete for a long time and would probably benefit from having the concrete removed and some restoration done. The area around these oaks looks like it is to be landscaped which will actually improve their health. The concrete should be kept over the root zones until the landscaping phase to protect the roots.

This property has considerable canopy cover even with some large open areas. There are some cypress trees on the east side of the property that are dead and will be removed. There are a number of small to medium sized trees shown as to be added to the landscape. These trees should bring the canopy cover up to the target in the UFS. Additional plantings in the strip of property leading to the park could increase the canopy cover if required without negatively impacting the function of the yard.

Tree protection fencing will have to be inspected before demolition starts. Please call the Parks Department for inspection at 250-592-7275.

DISTRICT OF
OAK * BAY
GENERAL
This form MUST BE COMPLETED and submitted with your package for the Advisory Design Panel. Property Address 3055 VALDEZ PLACE Date $\qquad$ APRIL. $5 / 19$

MATERIALS AND COLOURS

ITEM
WINDOWS
Windows
DOORS
Exterior Doors
Garage Doors
Accessory Building
TRIM
Doors
Windows CEDAR $1 \times 6$.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$ Charcoal. CHARCOAL

ROOF
Roofing
Flashing
Fascia
Soffit
SIDING
 $\qquad$
$\qquad$
HARD SURFACES
Driveway
Walkway
Patio ASPHALT W/LONC. BORER. BLACK/GREY
GRAVEL, CONC, TILE GREYS.
PORCELAIN TILE GREY
FENCE
Fencing

$$
\text { CEDAR } 1 \times 4=1 \times 6
$$

$\qquad$
LIGHTING $\qquad$
$\qquad$
Exterior
Landscape PATH LIGHTS
$\qquad$ Natural
$\qquad$
$\qquad$ BLACK. FIBREGLASS.
$\qquad$ CHARCOAL.

$\qquad$
MAPLE/BLACK 2E flash.
$\qquad$
NC
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

ATTACH SAMPLES TO REVERSE SIDE

## oisferc of

OAK*BAY

## Materials and Colours Checklist

## SAMPLE MATERIALS

ATTACH CHIP SAMPLE HERE
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taylor residence TAALOR RESIDENCE
3055 VALDEE PL. oak Bar, bc. mar 202019 As shown $\left.\right|^{\text {omager }}$ 30 6
overall site plan

taylor residence
TALLOR RESIDENCE
3055 VALLEEZ PL.
oavkevec.
$\qquad$
40 F 6


Tar TAYLOR RESIDENCE
3055 VALDEZ PL.
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PROPOSED



1. PARTIAL CIRCULAR PANORAMIC VIEW OF CUL-DE-SAC

NEIGHBOURING PROPERTY
3000 VALDEZ PLACE (CURRENTLY EMP
3000 VALDEZ PLACE (CURRENTLY EMPTY LOT)

NEIGHBOURING PROPERTY
3020 VALDEZ PLACE

NEIGHBOURING PROPERTY
3046 VALDEZ PLACE
2. PARTIAL CIRCULAR PANORAMIC VIEW OF CUL-DE-SAC

3. VIEW UP VALDEZ PLACE LOOKING NORTH - WEST

4. VIEW DOWN VALDEZ PLACE LOOKING SOUTH - EAST (TOWARDS BEACH DRIVE)

5. VIEW Towards valdez place Looking west
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