

*The Panel recessed at 1:40pm, and reconvened at 2:00pm.*

*Paul Hammond recused himself from Development Permit with Variances No. 00060 for 1811 Oak Bay Avenue.*

### **3.3 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00060 for 1811 Oak Bay Avenue**

The City is considering a Development Permit with Variances Application to construct a five-storey building containing approximately 15 dwelling units at a density of 1.6:1 floor space ratio (FSR).

Applicant meeting attendees:

CHRIS ROWE

LOW HAMMOND ROWE ARCHITECTS INC.

Mr. Johnson provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the application and the areas that staff is seeking advice on, including the following:

- exterior access
- the proposal's relationship to adjacent properties.

Mr. Rowe provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal.

Questions of clarification were asked by the Panel on the following:

- is this a wood frame building?
  - yes
- what is the rationale behind the cladding palette?
  - the applicants began with an arrangement for a base, middle and top
  - the brick adds solidity in the base and complements the brick paving and concrete on the ground plane
  - the stucco above is lightweight and does not look too heavy
  - the green accents lighten the mood on the west façade
  - the durable copper screening adds texture to what is otherwise a small, economically-built apartment building
- were the screens initially proposed as wood?
  - yes, however wood was rejected due to fire code
- what is the size of the screen perforations?
  - they will be as illustrated on the plans, and have been scaled down for the materials board
- where is the wood cladding proposed?
  - this cladding is used as a liner for the pocket balconies, and as one of the exterior claddings
- is there a planted boulevard the whole way along the street?
  - Mr. Johnston clarified that the Statutory Right-of-Way was a requirement for the site, and the sidewalk's location provides space for wider planting and future plans for the roadway
- what is the height of the overhang above the sidewalk?
  - it is 9ft tall at the shortest point, as required by the City

- is the planter separating the sidewalk from the units along Oak Bay Avenue intended as privacy screening?
  - the planter's total width is just over 2ft., leaving about 18" of very deep planting space
  - the proposed planting includes ferns and salal, and is intended to be evergreen and lush without blocking light to the units
- was commercial space considered at the ground level?
  - Mr. Johnston clarified that commercial uses are not permitted within the current zoning, and the application does not include rezoning the site
  - the applicants noted that the site will be entirely residential
- what is the location of the windows within the rooms?
  - the windows have a low sill and extend to the ceiling
  - the interior configuration is still being resolved, particularly at the south elevation
- the level 3 floor plan shows a full window in the bedroom and kitchen; is this correct?
  - this may be a coordination error; the large windows are intended for either living spaces or bedrooms
  - the small windows' locations may shift
- were smaller windows considered for the south-facing windows overlooking neighbours?
  - the adjacent house has no windows on its north side, and the proposal overlooks only the neighbour's roof
  - there are no privacy issues for the first three floors, and the upper floors step back
  - it is the nature of corridor development that there will be some overlook
- has any energy modelling been completed?
  - no energy modelling has yet been completed, but the proposal will be constructed to a built-green standard
- is offsetting the energy gains thorough the south- and east-facing windows anticipated?
  - any need for offsetting will emerge from energy modelling that has yet to be completed
- will any changes be made to the exterior of the building, or would energy offsetting simply be done through the installation of blinds?
  - the building's massing would not be increased, and there are many possible solutions to offset energy gains including blinds and exterior shutters
  - air conditioning may also be used
- how does vehicle circulation function for parking stall 1?
  - the proposal currently includes an excess of parking, so this stall may be eliminated
- can the parking be reduced to retain the large maple tree at the corner of the site?
  - the arborist's report recommended removal as a better long-term solution, but much will depend on what is found through excavation
  - much thought has gone towards this matter, and it will continue to be reviewed
  - if the tree has to be removed, a fairly mature will replace it
- what is the rationale for the copper screening at the front entrance?
  - glass was considered, but the view inside is only towards the stairs and the elevator shaft and the copper does not add further materials to the palette
  - the lighting and door handles help to signify entry, and the perforated screen acts as a double door between two outdoor spaces

- were smaller windows considered for bedrooms?
  - the interior layouts are still being configured, and some windows may be changed on private elevations
- will potential changes to the window configuration impact the northeast or northwest corner elevations?
  - these are significant elevations, and the window arrangement can be maintained with updates to the spandrels
  - the ratio of openings to walls will be maintained.

Panel members discussed:

- appreciation for the applicants' explanation of the building's massing
- the proposal as a striking piece of architecture
- the necessity of technical resolution of the details, given the proposal's complicated form in wood frame construction
- the need for simplicity in the cladding, given building's formal complexity
- the overhangs and recesses taking away from the building's form
- appreciation for the scale of the proposal and how it turns corners
- the proposal's spirited approach to massing
- desire for a reduction in proposed materials
- the need to resolve the transition between brick and stucco at the northwest corner, as well as the between the wood and stucco on the decks
- concern for stucco as a material choice, and the potential long-term issues in how it will age
- no issues with the exterior stair access; the screen and proposed colours are lively
- opportunity for the zero lot line to add to the pedestrian feel and slow down vehicular traffic along Oak Bay Avenue
- desire to push sidewalk away from the building, and if this cannot be done, potential to increase the ground floor setback
- appreciation for the current window configuration; however, concern for the lack of resolution as changes in fenestration may alter the appearance of the proposal
- privacy and liveability concerns for the first floor bedroom units facing Oak Bay Avenue
- desire for commercial uses at the ground floor, and the arbitrary nature of residential zoning at this location
- desire to retain the large maple tree at the southwest corner of the property.

**Motion (defeated):**

It was moved by Jason Niles, seconded by Justin Gammon, that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00060 for 1811 Oak Bay Avenue be approved as presented, with consideration to the following comments:

- simplify and resolve the cladding materials
- resolve the fenestration with regards to interior layouts and privacy
- reconsider the interior configuration of the ground floor unit 101 to remove bedrooms from proximity to the Oak Bay avenue frontage
- reconfigure the parkade structure to retain the existing maple tree at the southwest corner property line, if feasible.

**Defeated**

For: Jesse Garlick (Chair); Justin Gammon; Deborah LeFrank; Jason Niles

Opposed: Elizabeth Balderston; Sorin Birliga; Carl-Jan Rupp; Stefan Schulson

**Motion:**

It was moved by Justin Gammon, seconded by Jesse Garlick, that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00060 for 1811 Oak Bay Avenue be approved subject to the following changes:

- simplify and resolve the cladding materials
- resolve the fenestration with regards to interior layouts and privacy
- reconsider the interior configuration of the ground floor unit 101 to remove bedrooms from proximity to the Oak Bay avenue frontage
- reconfigure the parkade structure to retain the existing maple tree at the southwest corner property line, if feasible.

**Carried**

For: Jesse Garlick (Chair); Elizabeth Balderston; Justin Gammon; Deborah LeFrank; Jason Niles; Stefan Schulson

Opposed: Sorin Birliga; Carl-Jan Rupp