

CITY OF PARKSVILLE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL

AGENDA

Date: July 8, 2010
Time: 2:00 PM
Place: PCTC, The Forum

1. Call to Order

2. Adoption of Minutes:
Minutes of May 13, 2010

3. Development Permit Application (148 Weld Street)
Legal: Lots 20 and 21, District Lot 13, Nanoose District, Plan 1565
Applicant: Carsten Jensen of Carsten Jensen Architect Inc.
Owner: 619270 B.C. Ltd.
Planning File: 3060-10-05

4. Development Permit Application (170 and 192 Jensen Avenue East and 225 Corfield Street)
Legal: Lots A, B, and C, District Lot 13, Nanoose District, Plan VIP86247
Applicant: Neil Pelman of Pelman Architecture Inc.
Owner: MacLean Homes (Parksville Seniors) Ltd. & MacLean Homes (Jensen) Ltd.
Planning File: 3060-10-06

4. Adjournment:

NEXT MEETING
AUGUST 12, 2010
PCTC, THE FORUM

TO BE ADOPTED

CITY OF PARKSVILLE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date: May 13, 2010
Time: 2:00 pm
Place: PCTC, The Forum
Chair: M. Lafoy

Members Present:

<u> X </u>	M. LaFoy	<u> </u>	L. Taylor
<u> X </u>	R. Galdames	<u> </u>	L. Locke
<u> X </u>	D. Firouzli		

Others:

B. Russell, Manager of Current Planning
D. McIntyre, David Nairne & Associates Ltd.
M. Fraser, Liberty Contract Management

1. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 2:03 pm by the Chair.

2. Adoption of Minutes:

Moved by R. Galdames Seconded by D. Firouzli

That the minutes of the meeting of April 8, 2010 be approved.

3. Development Permit Application (211 Alberni Highway & 160, 186 & 192 Jensen Avenue West)

Legal: Lot 21, District Lot 14, Nanoose District, Plan 5663
Lot A, District Lot 14, Nanoose District, Plan 31670
Lot 18, District Lot 14, Nanoose District, Plan 5663, Except Part in Plan 36492
Lot 17, District Lot 14, Nanoose District, Plan 5663
Applicant: David Nairne & Associates Ltd.
Owner: City of Parksville
Planning File: 3060-10-04

The applicant has returned to the Panel with further consideration being given to the following:

1. The manner of composition and treatment of canopies (including those at all entrances);
2. Review for consistent treatment of elevations in consideration of the use of two materials;
3. Reconsideration of the expression of the fire hose tower;
4. Reconsideration in the context of a 'Gateway Building' which should be readily recognized and create an important and unusual statement to the community.

Applicant Presentation:

A presentation by D. McIntyre described changes made to the application since it was previously reviewed by the Advisory Design Panel as follows:

Changes made include more consistency between materials. Use of hardy panel [predominately] with metal cladding as an accent on the corner to break-up boxiness of the building. The design is intended to make old and new look cohesive. There will likely be wood canopies. It will be made of heavy timber structure and columns. Canopy at the 14 foot level will be illuminated using under lighting to provide an interesting night time appearance.

Bright graphics are to be incorporated on the fire bay doors as that is where the action happens. Hose tower has been made more prominent. The hose tower was raised and the other roofs were lowered. G. Jackson had previously indicated that the original tower location appeared monolithic. The tower has been relocated to improve the massing of the building. In addition, the use of metal accents are being used with the predominant hardy plank.

The site features a very prominent corner. To make the corner interesting big 3-D letters "FIRE HALL" about 1 - 1.5 metres high are proposed.

Originally the building was proposed to be LEED certified. The building is still green and will be constructed to a LEED standard, but will not be certified due to prohibitive costs. The project will use recycled materials, drought tolerant plants, rain garden, etc.

The building is essentially carbon neutral and has natural lighting opportunities. In addition, it uses water efficient plumbing and also includes a bike rack.

Lighting of the site follows the FLAP 'Fatal Light Awareness Program' principles [FLAP has goals of reducing bird collisions with buildings through light techniques]

Redesign provides a stronger architectural presence while better addressing overall massing.

Panel Discussion:

Q. Like the graphics. Recommend that the letters be included. To staff, is it possible to vary the signage requirements?

Staff. It is only possible to vary the signage requirements as part of the Development Permit if it improves the project in meeting the applicable Development Permit guidelines.

Q. How are the corners of the building being done?

- A. *Mitered corners.*
- Q. *Did the south side previously show more landscaping?*
- A. *It was changed due to lane allowance. Also, more room was needed to manoeuvre fire trucks. There is less landscaping but now includes pervious pavers. Relocation of the hose tower to improve massing reduced the landscaping.*
- Q. *On the second floor there is a door?*
- A. *Yes, there is a door. The door will allow for a deck in the future should it be desired.*
- Q. *Also, I like the graphics and note that the bay door height was reduced. Was this done to allow for a second floor?*
- A. *Yes, the building has been structurally designed to accommodate a second floor in the future.*
- Q. *Red colour looks nice, have you considered it a colour for the flashing?*
- A. *The flashing proposed will be metal colour.*
- Q. *Red colour looks nice, what are you considering for flashing?*
- A. *Using metal look.*
- Q. *Enamoured with the proposed large lettering. Vandalism, how will it be addressed?*
- A. *The letters will be constructed of plate steel. They would be strong enough that kids could not push it over and not so high that if it was climbed upon someone would get hurt. The lettering forms a landmark at a highly visible location.*
- Q. *There is a local aluminum manufacturer here. Would you consider another material such as aluminum? I will leave that with you.*
- A. *Aluminum would now likely be a target of theft due to its salvage value.*
- Comment. *Will leave that with you to choose.*
- Q. *Why that colour? And how do the metal elements return at the corners?*
- A. *The corners dive into the building. The colours are selected to mimic natural wood colours and match natural deck materials.*
- Comment. *It appears more consistent.*

A. *Colour matched to cedar. Wood is not durable enough and difficult to maintain. It has the look of wood without being wood. It is much more durable and won't go grey and weather.*

Q. *Not sure colour reflects Parksville. What is the City's coat of arms or the fire departments?*

Staff. *Yellow, blue, etc.*

Q. *What is the scale of the canopy posts and beams?*

A. *4 X 8. Hard at this scale of drawing to show canopy effectively, similar to proportions down at the Beach Club resort canopy.*

Q. *Is there a vertical?*

A. *No.*

Q. *The western portion is now just a horizontal canopy, not columns?*

A. *Because the fire trucks are moving the columns were avoided (might cause damage). Angle brackets would give it strength.*

Q. *Hard to see in the plans.*

A. *I understand the concerns.*

Comment: *Nice striking gateway building. Remediation of a portion of the building has spoken to all the issues.*

Comment: *Could you add some description of the canopy in resolution?*

Comment: *Pleasant, bold, like the graphics [referring to the fire bay door graphics].*

Recommendation: Moved by R. Galdames Seconded by D. Firouzli

THAT Council should accept the design proposal based on drawings and presented to the Advisory Design Panel for Lot 21, District Lot 14, Nanoose District, Plan 5663, Lot A, District Lot 14, Nanoose District, Plan 31670, Lot 18, District Lot 14, Nanoose District, Plan 5663, Except Part in Plan 36492, and Lot 17, District Lot 14, Nanoose District, Plan 5663 (211 Alberni Highway and 160, 186 & 192 Jensen Avenue West) subject to consideration by the applicant of the details of the canopy bracketing system.

AND THAT a relaxation to the City's Sign Regulation Bylaw be considered as part of the Development Permit to enable the proposed signage to occur. **CARRIED**

4. Adjournment:

Moved by R. Galdames Seconded by D. Firouzli

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.

M. Lafoy
Chair

BR/dd

I:\Users\Planning\0540-20\Advisory Design Panel\2010\MinMay13-10.