

CITY OF PARKSVILLE  
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date: August 11, 2011  
Time: 2:00 PM  
Place: PCTC, The Forum  
Chair: M. Lafoy

Members Present:

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

Others:

- B. Russell, Manager of Current Planning, City of Parksville
- G. Jackson, Director of Community Planning, City of Parksville
- D. Banks, Fire Chief, City of Parksville
- D. Neale, Oceanside Animal Hospital Ltd.
- D. McIntyre, David Nairne & Associates Ltd.
- C. Zukiwsky, Liberty Contract Management

Two member of the public were in attendance

1. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 2:01 PM by the Chair.

2. Adoption of Minutes:

Minutes of October 28, 2010.

3. Motion:

That the agenda be altered for the inclusion of new business as Agenda item number 6.

CARRIED.

**4. Development Permit and Development Variance Permit (145 Memorial Avenue)**

Legal: Parcel B (being a consolidation of Lots 26, 27, 30 and 31, See FB410184), Block 3  
District Lot 89 Nanoose District Plan 1504

Owner: Oceanside Animal Hospital Ltd., Inc. No. 0638908

Applicant: Waters & Associates

File Number: 3060-11-05

**Applicant Presentation:**

- The Applicant, Don Neale, presented to the Advisory Design Panel (ADP) the need for the expansion to the existing animal care facility and the proposed inclusion of a dog spa within the building.
- Exterior plantings to have a drip irrigation system.
- Lights to be installed in the landscaping that will illuminate building wall. Lights to use a protective screen and be timed.
- Details were provided about the therapeutic pool. Only requires water changes at 3 - 6 month intervals.
- Energy efficient windows to be used as well as a heat pump.
- Some chlorine use.
- Will have some roof vents to remove moisture.
- Treadmill for dogs also included, intended to expand post-op care.
- Pool uses a number of pumps that are contained within the building addition.
- Exterior of building addition shown.

**[Panel Discussion]**

- Q. *The siding shown in the elevation plan does not appear to match the pattern on the existing building. Is this your intention?*
- A. *It is something the building designer came up with. I hear what you're saying with respect to the pattern of the siding and also prefer the original look. Not sure why the design is different.*
- Q. *Is there not a handicap parking space?*
- A. *There presently is not one. I believe we are below the threshold that triggers the requirement. It may be possible to create the 7th stall as a handicap space. We will look into it and may be able to accommodate.*
- Q. *Where is the exterior garbage storage area?*
- A. *This type of business does not use a dumpster. The garbage and recyclables are stored within the building.*
- Q. *You have mentioned a number of items that require mechanical controls and venting. Are there any details showing where the equipment, heat pumps and vents will be located?*
- A. *The mechanical equipment is to be located within the building with vents on the roof.*
- Q. *Are there any details on how the venting and heat pumps will be screened on the roof?*
- A. *We have not got to that detailed level of design yet.*

- Q. *The building entrance looks level, how much effort is required to open the doors?*
- A. *The doors do not require much effort to open. Also, the building features a fully accessible washroom.*

Panel Discussion:

*Will need to advise the City with respect to setback. Prepared to entertain setback. Defer recommendation on what the applicant and Panel would like to see regarding the siding materials versus what is shown on the plans. Need to revisit the details and form of the exterior mechanical works and exhaust vents. Opportunity for inclusion of handicap parking space to be explored. Health care across street uses up all parking on one side of street. Wonder if other on-street handicap parking can be created. Hard to find suitable parking.*

**Recommendation:**

**THAT** Council should consider granting the variance request for the building addition to the Oceanside Animal Hospital that is proposed on Parcel B (being a consolidation of Lots 26, 27, 30 and 31, See FB410184), Block 3, District Lot 89, Nanoose District, Plan 1504 (145 Memorial Avenue);

**AND FURTHER THAT** the Advisory Design Panel recommended that the following items proposed for Parcel B (being a consolidation of Lots 26, 27, 30 and 31, See FB410184), Block 3 District Lot 89 Nanoose District Plan 1504 (145 Memorial Avenue) should be revisited and presented to the Panel at a future meeting:

- That the existing exterior stucco and siding pattern be considered for retention and that the pattern be incorporated into the addition;
- That a colour elevation, including proposed signage, be prepared for presentation;
- Provide detail on the location and form of proposed exterior ventilation systems and how they are proposed to be concealed;
- Consider the incorporation of a dedicated handicap parking space within the on-site parking layout or alternatively explore with the City's Engineering and Operations Department the feasibility of a suitable handicap space being provided on-street.

**CARRIED**

**5. Advisory Design Panel concerns respecting Development Permit (160 Jensen Avenue West)**

Legal: Lot A, District Lot 14, Nanoose District, Plan EPP7534

Owner: City of Parksville

Applicant: Parksville Volunteer Fire Department

Panel comment:

*Panel has strong concern over colour scheme changes.*

- A. *The market price of cedar lap siding did not fit with budget. Were and still are going for a natural lap look. Ended up going with Hardiplank due to cost savings. Offers 10 year warranty and requires no maintenance. Huge maintenance savings. No fading for 10 years. Cedars costs much higher. With Hardiplank colours are more limited. Trying to match*

*natural cedar difficult with the result being too orange and unnatural looking. Limited cost saving if cement fibre board is painted. Wanted natural wood colour not a nasty colour. The pre-coloured Hardiplank have a more restrictive colour pallet. See the corrugated metal and door graphics as key visual features that make the building pop. Colours selected were natural tones available from the limited pallet that would be appropriate for an institutional type building. Most complete backed product. Also do not recall cedar with clear coat.*

*Cedar is \$1.05 per square foot and Hardie plank is about \$0.90 per square foot. However, the cedar needs to be coated and this cost close to \$2.00 per square foot. If the Hardiplank is painted it also costs close to \$2.00 per square foot. There is a significant difference in cost between the cedar, pre-tinted Hardie plank and on-site painted Hardie plank. Rough sawn cedar with the same finish costs the same as painted Hardie plank but only has a two year warranty.*

**Panel Comment:**

*Issue with how the colours integrate with the building design. The colour of the product is too uniform. The colour creates a ghastly appearance with the metal cladding. Need to darken and somehow increase the colour contrast. It presently looks blah. Not enough value (tone) difference, something the Panel really liked in the original design.*

- A. *Custom colour can only be added at significant cost on-site. It affects the durability and maintenance of the building one year versus 10 years.*

**Panel Comment:**

*Disagrees with time duration given; normal paint good for six years. Is four years extra worth the design sacrifice?*

- A. *Composition of design is subjective. Everyone enjoyed what was proposed and appreciated the range of colours and materials. We appreciate that, but the budget started to extend due to technical needs and Fire Department requirements. Need to keep in mind that the colour graphics are not on the door yet and that will make the building pop.*

**Panel Comment:**

*Is art on the doors helpful to the design given that the Fire Hall doors are typically open?*

- A. *We feel that when the doors are open that the Fire Hall is more interesting and have coloured the interior of the bays accordingly.*
- A. *Would not consider painting Hardiplank as it eliminates the 90% cost savings. Cost of Hardiplank painted is the same as the original cedar. Cost went to items the Fire Department needs such as equipment lockers and hallway modifications. All aspects to reduce cost were to reallocate resources available to make the Fire Hall more functional for the firefighters.*

*We believe we maintained the aesthetics and did not lower them. Attention was paid to details. The fire bays when the doors are open have interesting colours, for example, not just blank walls. Details on the back of the building are also of a high quality. Significant landscaping is used on the site. Innovative rain garden is included as well as grasscrete and other sustainable initiatives. Planted trees include 7 centimetre calliper size.*

Panel comments:

*Original design was more fun and exciting. The cedar colour popped out from the building.*

- A. *Acknowledge that the original rendering had more pop. Some prefer on-site finish, some don't.*

Q. *What was the original trim that was proposed?*

- A. *No trim, metal corners and cedar trim around the garage bay doors. Also, some of the considerations were about meeting sustainability objectives. Hardiplank is recyclable, more affordable and does not require painting or the same level of maintenance. Unfortunately there is a trade-off in that there is a more limited ready-made colour selection available. Believe it is hard to judge the appearance of the project without the finished landscaping and the addition of the door graphics.*

*For the record, a small section of Hardiplank was painted on-site due to damage of the pre-tinted material in shipping. We were not in a position to afford the 2 - 3 week delay. Don't like that this happened but it will be as close as possible to the original colour, but can't guarantee fading. The building is being judged before it is in its final form. There is still painting to do and graphic elements to add. We are confident that it is something the City can be proud of.*

Panel Comments:

*Building appears to be exude drabness. Mouse or rat colour fails to compliment the building design. Major departure was made from what was presented. How to proceed? Goes to Design Panel and then on-site the structure changes from what was endorsed and what was approved. It begs the question as to why we [and they] the City spend the time.*

- A. *The changes were not made without thought. Are disappointed that this is perceived as such. Colour is subjective. Don't find it drab or unattractive. Changes were made in consideration of all requirements, including the terms of reference and the budget.*

Panel Comment:

*Vinyl is lower cost to; would the end result be attractive with vinyl? The colours proposed are absurd.*

Q. *Is there a way that resources could be allocated to address the colour? Is there not the budget to do it?*

- A. *It is possible but it would require additional funds. It would require spending additional money from a very tight public budget to re-paint a pre-coloured product and would reduce its longevity and increase maintenance.*

Presentation of proposed signs by Doug Banks, Fire Chief:

*Proposed Fire Department signs shown to the Advisory Design Panel. Both signs are very similar to the City's black and gold sand dollar signs used at the Community Park, downtown centre and at Public Works. Some creative licence in preliminary designs that are shown. One sign uses Fire Department logo other uses City logo.*

Q. *Did the original budget include signage?*

A. *Not specifically.*

Q. *Proposed signage seems regressive compared to the large original signage that was proposed for the gateway corner. Like the building, less colourful.*

Staff. *The original signage was eliminated at the corner to be revisited at a later date. In part this was to allow the signage to reflect the common branding for civic facilities and to also provide a future location opportunity of public art. The original signage raised concerns that it would attract vandalism.*

*Panel Comments:*

*Need to look at a process change when there are changes of substance like what occurred at the Fire Hall. The Panel needs to have information to review the changes. Primarily our focus is form and character. Should also comment on colour as it is an integral part of design. Need to look at how to address future projects. Need to explain to community why things are different than presented. Believe Panel works in best interest of the community and does a superb job. Need to look for a process to prevent this scale of change from happening in the future without some form of reconsideration by the Advisory Design Panel and the municipality. Otherwise it is a waste of time that others can do what they please. There needs to be a way to seek Panel input in changes that occur during the building permit stage and incorporate it into the process. Design should meet the terms of permit.*

Staff. *The City would welcome the input. Need to consider that there are almost always some field changes. It is not a simple task to outline what changes require a revisit to the Design Panel. What is an insignificant enough field change?*

Q. *Could not a term of the permit read that a significant material change requires review acceptance by the Advisory Design Panel?*

Staff. *What constitutes a significant material change?*

Q. *Is there not a way to a face-to-face on-site review of the project as it progresses and stop the project where there are changes?*

Staff. *What changes are acceptable and to whom? Not one change? The less subjective the better.*

*Panel Comment:*

*Panel will do some investigation on the topic of process and will co-ordinate it through the Chair. It would also be helpful to have a Council liaison again. It was beneficial to have a representative convey the discussions of the Panel to Council. Would like a member of the Panel, if possible, to attend Council with the proposal that the liaison be reinstated.*

Staff. *It may be more appropriate if the Chair was to approach the Mayor directly with the request of the reinstatement of a Council liaison position. Panel could put together a list of benefits and take it from there.*

Panel Discussion:

*It would be a great addition to have a Councillor's view. Many of the discussions not transferred through to Council. It would be helpful in clarifying the role of the Panel to Council.*

Staff. *The Councillor would not be a voting member of the Panel but would rather make observations on its conduct.*

Panel Discussion:

*Design is hard to articulate. The community tries to understand what we do but presently appear unaware of what the Panel does. It would be helpful to maybe have a press release that explains what we do. Need to ask Council for an Advisory Design Panel liaison and put together process for in the field changes to approved permits. May be a role in the process for the Oceanside Development and Construction Association etc. There is a need to educate the public about the role of the committee.*

**Recommendation:**

**THAT** City Administration consider a request by the Advisory Design Panel for an Advisory Design Panel Council liaison.

**CARRIED**

5. **New Business:**

The Panel made notice of motion that it is preparing a recommendation to City administration to consider changes to Development Permit application process to address concerns of the Panel with respect to completed projects.

6. **Adjournment:**

Moved by L. Taylor, Seconded by G. Price

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:58 PM.

---

M. LAFOY  
Chair

BR/sh