

CITY OF PARKSVILLE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date: July 8, 2010
Time: 2:00 pm
Place: PCTC, The Forum
Chair: M. Lafoy

Members Present:

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

Others:

- B. Russell, Manager of Current Planning
- C. Jensen, M.Arch., MAIBC, MRAIC, Carsten Jensen Architect
- Dr. G. Wilson, President, 619270 B.C. Ltd.
- G. Wilson, Secretary, 619270 B.C. Ltd.
- N. Pelman, B.Arch, MAIBC, Pelman Architecture Inc.
- L. Chorobik, Landscape Architect, Viewpoint Landscape Architects Inc.
- J. MacLean, MacLean Homes Ltd.

1. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 2:04 pm by the Chair.

2. Adoption of Minutes:

Moved by R. Galdames Seconded by D. Firouzli

That the minutes of the meeting of May 13, 2010 be approved.

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

Applicant Presentation:

A presentation by C. Jensen described the above-mentioned proposal to Advisory Design Panel as follows:

We have provided context and images of surrounding dwellings and businesses (such as Pizza Connection next door).

It is a 3 storey building with a laneway at the rear.

Garbage is enclosed and fenced at back.

A loading area is provided.

There is a 5 foot fence at the loading area.

Main floor dental office with upper floor apartments.

There is 1.2 metres on either side for exterior paths.

Curb and sidewalk is identified at the front as developer street upgrade costs.

There is a 1.5 metre hedge at the rear and a wooden fence at the side adjacent to the single family residence.

The front of the building sits at the lot line.

There is 27.6 metres of frontage with doors spaced close to the guidelines at the suggested 9 metre frequency.

Second Floor

- Setback 1 m - 1.5 m with 4 small bays projecting approximately 600 mm. forward
- Central corridor features stairs
- 6 apartment units will be strata titled

Third Floor

- 4 larger two-bedroom units
- Setback 1.1 to 1.5 metres from 2nd floor
- Multiple balconies

Style of Building

- Pitched mansard roof, flat on top but given the pitch it will appear as a pitched roof.
- Gable elements with beam and timber features.
- Hardie board siding
- Premium asphalt shingle
- Stone work at base
- Expresses a more complex elevation
- Did not want 3 stories of firewall, hence side setback and pedestrian paths
- Expressing a three dimensional building

Downtown Master Plan colour palette presented to client in different building iterations. Specific colour scheme selected by client. Consistent with other buildings on Weld Street and presents a strong personality.

Adjacent is a two-storey building. The proposed building picks-up the height and eve-line as an adjacent building. Photo rendering shows adjacencies.

Front elevation presents most strongly to the street. There are trellises along each side. Materials are the same at other elevations as they are at the front, such as: cedar soffits and beams, hardie board and panels. It presents a strong expression of the levels and variegated façade. Other side is a mirror of the front, but with less detail to be experienced.

Panel Discussion:

- Q. *Front side, no apparent setback. Not much landscaping there.*
- A. *Meets zoning setbacks. Street trees and lamp post by City.*
- Q. *What are the plans for making the project more environmentally friendly?*
- A. *We have an environmental approach. For example, landscaping is drought tolerant and we are looking into possibility of including rainwater harvesting, but are strongly focused on high energy efficiency as we believe it has greater benefits. High insulation factors are proposed for all building walls using structural insulated panels. Have an insulation value of R30 and with truss portions having a value of R60, well beyond conventional building fixtures. Dr. Wilson will continue to own building.*
- Q. *Lack of planting and landscaping. Asphalt area could be made to be less bare.*
- A. *Lots of hedging plus concrete walkway is trellised softening-up the look. 5 foot high wooden fence with lattice also proposed and is intended to match cedar of building.*
- Q. *Hedging will have a green element and more may be needed - possibly consider removing a parking space.*
- A. *Hedging will have a green element. To add more would mean removal of a parking space.*
- Q. *Adding more colour or tones may bring more interest to the building. Have you looked at more colour hues?*
- A. *The Colour does not directly reflect its neighbours but is within keeping with those suggested within the Downtown Master Plan which tends to show natural tones. The colour is similar to other buildings in the downtown in addition two or three newer buildings have stone and wood materials.*
- Q. *How is the fire separation?*
- Q. *What about fire separation?*
- A. *Fire separation is within code and building will be sprinklered. In addition, lower windows are glass block.*
- Comment: *Like the finish. Did you look at layering of colours with darker on the bottom and lightening up as building gets higher? It may bring more interest to the building. Also, here is potential to carry over the glass gable to the back of the building.*
- Q. *Is privacy glass being used on the ground level?*
- A. *Along paths is glass block but the rest of the windows are standard glazing. Once tenant is known some screening may be selected.*
- Comment: *Sprinkler heads suggested at windows.*
- Q. *Any thoughts of a gate?*
- A. *Nothing prevents us from including one, but it is not being considered at this time.*
- Q. *Is there sufficient room for a wheelchair? It looks as if it is 4 feet at the canopy.*

- A. Yes, it is passable by a wheelchair. There is a 5 foot turnaround for wheelchair with eased curb there.
- Q. Is there light at the front of the building?
- A. Low down-lit and soffit lighting. Front lighting is more decorative.
- A. Not showing it, but if committee feels it is important we will consider additional lighting.
- Q. Can you explain balcony railings?
- A. Not glass all the way, they have a framed element and no heavy timbers at the railing.
- Comment: Very urbane design. Others will look to this as an example of the street form that we are looking for.
- Q. One concern, how are you going to address signage?
- A. Would like to see strata bylaw control signage limiting it to the main entrance. At this point the final commercial tenancy is unknown. It could be either a single or double tenancy. Would like the strata bylaw to choose the font and style and mount the letters on cedar. Would like a high quality for the proposed signs, but signage has not yet been finalized. Would encourage signage like the sample shown.
- Q. Night lighting can enhance or take away from a proposal.
- A. Soft indirect lighting is proposed in the soffits of the lower floors. This lighting would be automatic. The upper levels will have individually controlled lighting.
- Q. Is there lighting at the side wall and common areas?
- A. Have not shown lighting detail. Will use soffit lighting and there will be at least two City streetlights.
- A. Would like to use more expensive material where it has the most exposure. The back and roof are less visible. Building is west coast architecture consistent with the guidelines.
- Q. Why would you include a centre entrance to the upstairs at the front?
- A. Guidelines say that the doors should be spaced approximately 4.5 to 9 metres apart. With the central door we believe that we achieve the spirit of the guidelines with a spacing of no more than 10.5 metres.
- A. Trying to create some complexity.
- Q. At street level could the building be further back or have more generous alcoves?
- A. Can look at it.
- Q. Main entrance, it is wider, how about making it deeper?
- A. It may be possible to increase the entrances 600 mm.
- Q. Are the roofs at difference angles? Are the ones at the back steeper?
- A. You may be reading a difference in the 2 dimensional versus 3 dimensional drawing.

The Advisory Design Panel provides the following duly noted comments on the application as follows:

- Suggest the use of additional shades or hues to highlight the horizontal elements of the 3 storey building.
- Upper level gable glazing at rear of building should be consistent with street side of building.
- Entrances to be of more generous proportions (deeper/wider)
- Review night lighting and consider use of sufficient light at entry points, similar to other lighting proposed but more appropriate at entrances. In addition, the inclusion of security lighting on the sides along the paths should be included. Lighting should be consistent with dark sky principles.

- Consideration be given to enhance landscaping in back of building near parking curb and to enhance pedestrian access to the main central building entrance.

Recommendation: Moved by L. Locke Seconded by D. Firouzli

THAT Council should accept the design proposal based on drawings and presented to the Advisory Design Panel for Lots 20 and 21, District Lot 13, Nanoose District, Plan 1565 (148 Weld Street) subject to a Staff review conceding the duly noted comments of the Panel.
CARRIED

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

Applicant Presentation:

A presentation by N. Pelman, L. Chorobik and J. MacLean described the above-mentioned proposal to the Advisory Design Panel as follows:

There appears to be a big need for affordable housing in Parksville.

Land value is half what it was since it was purchased from the City. Originally, this was proposed to be a seniors village, but we have what we believe has a broader appeal.

Smaller ground oriented homes appear more popular in Parksville than apartment condominiums.

Have worked on the site layout to improve parking and driveway aprons.

The buildings range from 3 to 6-plex buildings.

There is 30% site coverage with lots of open spaces for landscaping.

Building all one storey and of a consistent theme.

Design features brighter colours providing warmth. Brown-Green, Rust-Red

Textures include the use of 'cedar looking' vinyl siding, premium duroid roof and cultured stone pylons. Site also features picket fencing.

The dwellings have nice 9 foot ceilings.

There are two main entrances to the site, one at Corfield Street and one at Jensen Avenue. There is also a secondary access off of McCarter Street.

Lighting consists of aluminum and glass bollards.

Each building has a frontage on an internal road and they all have their own back yard area. The buildings along Jensen Avenue are more double fronting.

There is a 5 to 6 foot grade change across site but due to distance covered is very subtle.

Sidewalks and paths are incorporated into the site.

There is a sign at the Jensen Avenue entrance.

Internal street provides a circular flow.

There are strong open space areas each providing opportunities for social gathering and recreation.

Low fencing bounds the area but does not promote separation. We wanted to maintain a sense of connection to the street.

Promote connection to the open spaces and maintain easy access to the garden areas.

Paving inserts and textured parking spaces are being considered.

Has good fronting on the street with a row of deciduous trees.

A pergola is proposed in the northwest open space area.

We would like to potentially eliminate the southwest corner access on McCarter.

On Jensen Avenue there is an attractive planter wall along the street.

Panel Discussion:

- Q. *What are the tree species?*
A. *There are several species.*
Q. *Is there a theme to the landscaping?*
A. *Yes, there are different trees and plants to give a sense of the Island.*
Q. *Are Evergreens included?*
A. *Not many evergreens, majority are deciduous.*
Q. *We are in the land of cedar and fir.*
A. *5% to 8% of the proposed trees are evergreen trees.*
A. *There is a cedar hedge along west side.*
Q. *What are the path design reasons?*
A. *Paths are designed to create a distinct area away from internal roads where possible.*
Q. *Are there mountable curbs?*
A. *Yes, rollover curbs.*
Q. *What is the price range?*
A. *No. The units are estimated to be in the \$270,000 to \$275,000 price range and have a floor area of approximately 1,050 to 1,150 sq. ft.*
Q. *Is there individual refuse pick-up?*
A. *Yes, it is preferable over a centralized pick-up.*
Q. *Are the units different dimensions?*
A. *No, they are all generally the same with 3 main building types A, B & C.*
Q. *A good niche market.*
Q. *Is it vinyl siding that is being proposed?*
A. *Yes, vinyl siding is being proposed for affordability to keep the units near the City's definition of affordable.*

- Q. Is the colour scheme distributed throughout the site?
A. Complementary colour scheme throughout the site. No side by sides of the same colour.
- Q. Fencing?
A. A low decorative picket fence is proposed along the frontage (Jensen Avenue). A solid 6 foot decorative wood fence where project is adjacent to the single family residential.
- Q. Is there further landscaping in addition to the trees?
A. More than 50% of plants are broadleaf evergreens with many indigenous shrubs included.
- Q. Good that you have screening so one couldn't walk up and see into windows along central path.
Q. Continuity of walking paths? Good to create a loop. Where is the connection?
A. There is a connection here and here (indicating direction of paths). In the context of this type of site sidewalks are often not used even when present; however, a number of paths and sidewalks are provided.
- Q. What is the paving treatment?
A. Aprons will be textured.
- Q. Anything to break up the dominance of the garage doors, such as windows?
A. Windows could be looked at for inclusion.
- Q. Given the unit size, where will storage be available?
A. Dormers may be used for storage area. They may also be able to use part of the attic above the garage for storage space. There were some changes to the roof from the original submission. The original design had a big and expensive roof. Current proposal has a reduced roof height.
- Q. The parking spills over on to aprons?
A. No, additional surface parking provided on-site is in accordance with City's 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit.
- Q. Have you looked at increasing the size of the open shelter in open space area? It could provide a place for the strata residents to have a barbeque area, etc.
A. That's an interesting idea, we will take a look at it.
- Q. Also any thoughts to a gate with respect to trespass of the open space areas?
A. Looking into a gate by the perimeter wall. Fencing there is 3 ft. high. You may want to restrict access to corner area and could consider a motion sensing light on wall.
- Q. Would there be a caretaker?
A. It would be up to the strata council to decide.
- Q. Will this project meet a changing market?
A. Our statistics show that it will meet the market and that it will have longevity. We have done everything to ensure marketability. We are in a desirable location right at the edge of downtown.
- Q. Entry off Corfield Street and Jensen Avenue. General tree lined street tree pattern. Don't understand that this is an entry point, no clear indication. Could street tree pattern be revisited?
A. We would be willing to look into it.
- Q. Are there two signs at the other entrance?
A. One sign at entrance, it had originally shown two.
- A. I would be favour of that. It is important that it is successful.
- Q. Question about walkway?
Q. Are there common areas? Is there an indoor space?

- A. Originally, there was a recreation building, but it was removed in subsequent revisions.
- Q. I live in a 56 unit strata. The recreation building is a well used part of the strata. If you change your mind it might be welcomed by future residents. There may be some differences with this project from the 1400 - 1800 sq. ft. strata units I am familiar with.
- A. These units are a different market. The units will be in the 1,000 - 1,100 sq. ft. range and are more affordable.
- Q. Who will the proposal be marketed to? Seniors? Young professionals?
- A. We are hoping it will be appealing to both. Originally, we were thinking that seniors would but we now feel that it may have a broader interest, may even include families.
- Q. Are there signs within the site?
- A. We are working out the internal diction signs.
- Q. Are the buildings sprinklered?
- A. Yes, the buildings will be sprinklered. In addition, there will be fire hydrants on site.
- Q. I like the north and west recitation areas. There appears to be more space for a gathering place closest to the street with some layout adjustment. Okay to just leave it though.
- Q. Is each phase a completely separate standalone setup? Are phases essentially the same? Phase 1 and 2 may make more sense as one phase as they present a complete streetscape internally.
- A. We are still considering how the phasing will be implemented. If Phase 1 sells then the rest should progress fairly rapidly.
- Q. Why not eliminate access to the back on McCarter Street? It seems superfluous and may be prone to trespass from people wishing to cross cut across the property.
- A. We would be happy to have it eliminated, but understand that it would require the City's okay.
- Q. We are here to deliberate on the form and character only and not the use of the land.

[Deliberation]

The Advisory Design Panel provides the following duly noted comments on the application as follows:

- Review and reconsider tree pattern along the street near entrances;
- Enhance interconnection of pathways and dedicated open space areas;
- Review necessity of southwest access (McCarter Street) and consider its possible elimination;
- Consider inclusion of windows in garage doors.

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 Lots A, B and C, District Lot 13, Nanoose District, Plan VIP86247 (170 and 192 Jensen Avenue East and 225 Corfield Street) subject to a Staff review conceding the duly noted comments of the Panel. **CARRIED**

5. Adjournment:

Moved by R. Galdames Seconded by L. Taylor

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:37 pm.



M. Lafoy
Chair

BR/dd

I:\Users\Planning\0540-20\Advisory Design Panel\2010\MinJuly08-10.