CITY OF PARKSVILLE

ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL

AGENDA

Date: September 11, 2014

Time: 2:00 PM

Place: PCTC, The Forum

1. Call to Order

2. Receipt of Minutes
   Minutes from May 8, 2014

3. Review of 826 ISLAND HIGHWAY WEST (WEMBLEY MALL)
   Legal: Lot 1 District Lot 74 Nanoose District, Plan EPP27137
   Owner: Parksville Properties Corp., Inc. No. 338979
   Applicant: ICR Projects Inc.
   File Number: 3060-PDP011
   Development Permit Area No. 5 - Shopping Centre

4. Adjournment

NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING OCTOBER 9, 2014
PCTC, THE FORUM
Call to Order:

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

Adoption of Minutes:

Moved by D. Firouzli Seconded by L. Locke

That the minutes of the meeting of December 13, 2013 be approved.  

CARRIED
2. **Review of 162 Morison**

Legal: Lot 1, District Lot 89, Nanoose District, Plan 43534  
Owner: Nagra, Gurdip Kaur  
Applicant: Carsten Jensen, Carsten Jensen Architect Inc.  
File: 3060-PDP0003  
Downtown - Development Permit Area 1 (Streetscape 4)

**Applicant Presentation:**

Carsten Jensen introduced the proposal for a second storey addition and interior/exterior renovation to 162 Morison Avenue - Bodyworks Fitness and Training. The proposal includes:

- A second floor addition;
- Existing building upgrades (showed rendering);
- Re-clad lower floor to a West Coast contemporary style;
- Laneway to existing parking lot - not much change proposed (but according to new guidelines);
- Existing parking area landscaping to be upgraded including addition of handicapped parking stall;
- Walkway is proposed to be retained as is but with the addition of new lighting;
- Large windows on both floors;
- Materials palate provided - 1/4" silver galvanized steel, hardiboard in-fill areas, wood fascia (dark brown), pine soffits;
- Building overhang projects over the municipal right of way, 28" deep (this has already gone before Council and requires an encroachment agreement);
- Planters at front entrance will be replanted;
- Loading space and refuse space not required for the gym use proposed (as per Planning Department staff);
- Landscaping:
  - Maintenance of existing planting;
  - Clearing and grubbing planters;
  - Triangular planters filled with drought tolerant plantings;
  - All ornamental plant material.

**Staff Comments**

Planning and Engineering departments have reviewed. There are site constraints because it is an existing building and a developed parking area.

**Panel Discussion**

- Re - bike rack addition. Did you lose one parking space?  
  - No, replaced an existing picnic table area.
- Panel asked about the intent to gate the existing walkway (shown on initial presentation drawing). Applicant advised that this has been removed from the proposal as City staff didn't support permanent gating of walkway. (City staff had previously advised the applicant that a gate was supported to reduce graffiti and address Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) but requested that the gate be open during business hours).
- Exterior lighting on the site was discussed; are there any skylights?  
  - No skylights proposed.
• Lighting as per drawings:
  o All lighting will be hourglass wash-down effect;
  o Three on front of building;
  o Two on the side of building;
  o Plan shows upward lighting which is less susceptible to vandalism;
  o Three lights on back of building.
• Signage at each entrance. Details to be worked out with signage company.
• Panel commented that they like the approach; a modern and clean look but would like lighter colour (personal taste difference). Good exterior materials. Again, commented that there are no skylights.
• Discussed accessibility; the building is only accessible on the ground floor. Accessibility issues that have been addressed are:
  o Accessible washroom on main floor;
  o Handicapped parking stall;
  o Ramp to entrance at the rear of the building.
• Panel discussed the building profile; parking lot (traditional curb), exterior colours (south side colour seems dark even though it’s southern exposure), rainwater leaders (new leaders will be interior), mechanical equipment (screened as per guidelines).
• Question about possibility of energy savings; solar cylinders, sensor lighting, sunlight tunnels, upgrading insulation. Applicant is open to cost saving ideas.
• General discussion about the addition of natural lighting throughout - applicant indicated a willingness to consider this, but pointed out a challenge due to the requirements for gym members to use full length mirrors for proper form during their workouts. Possible to provide windows above though.

**Recommendation**

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit application number PDP0003 submitted by Carsten Jensen Architecture Inc. on behalf of D. Nagra to renovate the interior/exterior and add a second storey to 162 Morison Avenue be approved subject to technical review by the Community Planning and Building department and Engineering and Operations department.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:47 pm.

L. Taylor  
Chair

SR/dy
1. **Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order at 2:10 pm.

**Adoption of Minutes:**

Minutes of the January 9, 2014 meeting could not be adopted because the panel didn't make up a quorum of three.

2. **Review of 779 Stanhope Road**

Legal: Lot 2, District Lot 87, Nanoose District, Plan 46927
Owner: N.R. Pass Construction Ltd., Inc. No. 0842575
File: PDP007
Downtown - Development Permit Area 4 - Multi-Unit and Intensive Residential
Blaine Russell gave a brief introduction describing the Advisory Design Panel review process as it pertains to this project.

**Applicant Presentation:**

Michelle Jones of Timberlake-Jones Engineering introduced the development proposal for a 43 lot small lot residential subdivision on Stanhope Road (backing onto Foster Park). This is the fourth application for the property (has been through rezoning, an OCP amendment and subdivision approval).

Form and character guideline challenges were determining just how many guidelines needed to be addressed for this type of development:

- Type of fencing most suitable for this development. Preliminary design - cedar fencing that varies in height as follows:
  - City requested fencing along public/private property line (lots backing onto Foster Park). Therefore, decided on four/five feet height along this side of the property;
  - Walkways between lots (entrances/exits to park) will be six feet in height at the center point then gradually decreasing to four/five feet towards the entrances/exits.
- BC Building Code changes (2012) were discussed as well as preliminary building designs. Applicant showed examples of a number of building designs scaled to an SLR-1 lot.
- Design meets the pertinent development guidelines.
- Form and Character guidelines met.
- Building scheme will include:
  - Landscape plan submission process;
  - Lighting, consisting of soffit lights and street lighting;
  - Completely accessible subdivision with sidewalks (five foot width), walkways, full access to sight;
  - Water and energy conservation options depending on house orientation - windows on south side; solar heating option.

**Panel Discussion**

Panel Questions:

- Accessibility of site?
  - Yes, fully accessible.
- Road names?
  - Roads haven’t been named yet.
- Where are sidewalks located?
  - On north side all the way around development. Sidewalk continues along highway to Pym Street (part of rezoning process).
- Building setbacks?
  - 1.5 metres.
• Fire truck accessibility?
  o Yes.

• How many hydrants and where are they located?
  o Four, located per engineering requirements.

• Where is parking?
  o One concealed parking spot (in garage), guest parking on driveway apron and street parking. No parking along Stanhope. *ask Blaine.

• Any RV parking?
  o Yes, to be screened but will limit building footprint which is about 1,000 to 1,200 square feet.

• Room for garden?
  o Yes, but limited according to building footprint again.

The Panel commented that this development is accessible, small and will require less upkeep. Good for aging in place, good demographics as is close to schools, transit, shopping etc. Haven’t seen an SLR-1 development at completed stage yet.

Blaine Russell explained to the panel that a resolution for this application could be to either support and forward it to Council or come back to the Advisory Design Panel when there are enough members present to make a quorum.

**Recommendation**

No official recommendation; panel attendance was insufficient to form a quorum.

Those in attendance indicated that the proposal presented appeared acceptable given the format of the development.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:50 pm.
PLANTED SIZE / REMARKS

COMMON NAME

BOTANICAL NAME

PLANT SCHEDULE

KEY

QTY

TREE

3

ACER RUBRUM 'ARMSTRONG'

COLUMNAR ARMSTRONG MAPLE

6CM CAL; 2M STD; B&B

4

FRAXINUS AMERICANA 'AUTUMN PURPLE'

AUTUMN PURPLE ASH

6CM CAL; 1.8M STD; B&B

3

THUJA PLICATA 'EXCELSA'

WESTERN RED CEDAR

2.75M HT; B&B

SHRUB

48

AZALEA JAPONICA 'GIRARD'S HOT SHOT'

AZALEA; SCARLET-ORANGE

#2 POT; 25CM

94

EUONYMUS ALATA 'COMPACTUS'

COMPACT WINGED BURNING BUSH

#2 POT; 30CM

12

HYDRANGEA SERRATA 'BLUEBIRD'

BLUEBIRD HYDRANGEA

#3 POT; 40CM

8

PINUS MUGO 'PUMILIO'

DWARF MUGO PINE

#3 POT; 40CM

111

ROSA EXPLORER 'CHARLES ALBANEL'

CHARLES ALBANEL ROSE; PINKISH-PURPLE

#3 POT; 60CM

GRASS

19

CHASMANTHIUM LATIFOLIUM

NORTHERN SEA OATS

#1 POT

306

HELICTOTRICHON SEMPERVIRENS

BLUE OAT GRASS

#1 POT

PERENNIAL

48

CROCOSMIA CROSOSMIFLORA 'VULCAN'

VULCAN CROCOSMIA

#1 POT; 25CM

28

HEMEROCALLIS

DAYLILY; COLOUR MIX - YELLOW, ORANGE, RED

#1 POT; 1-2 FAN

129

NEPETA X VERANICA 'DROPMORE'

CATMINT

#1 POT

89

RUDBECKIA FULGIDA VAR SULLIVANII `GOLDSTURM'

RUDBECKIA

#1 POT

GC

AJUGA REPTANS 'ATROPURPUREA'

CARPET BUGLE

#1 POT; 20CM

NOTES:  * PLANT SIZES IN THIS LIST ARE SPECIFIED ACCORDING TO THE BC LANDSCAPE STANDARD, LATEST EDITION. CONTAINER SIZES SPECIFIED AS PER CNTA STANDARDS. BOTH PLANT SIZE AND CONTAINER SIZE ARE THE MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE SIZES. * REFER TO SPECIFICATIONS FOR DEFINED CONTAINER MEASUREMENTS AND OTHER PLANT MATERIAL REQUIREMENTS. * SEARCH AND REVIEW: MAKE PLANT MATERIAL AVAILABLE FOR OPTIONAL REVIEW BY LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT AT SOURCE OF SUPPLY. AREA OF SEARCH TO INCLUDE LOWER MAINLAND AND FRASER VALLEY. * SUBSTITUTIONS: OBTAIN WRITTEN APPROVAL FROM THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT PRIOR TO MAKING ANY SUBSTITUTIONS TO THE SPECIFIED MATERIAL. UNAPPROVED SUBSTITUTIONS WILL BE REJECTED. ALLOW A MINIMUM OF FIVE DAYS PRIOR TO DELIVERY FOR REQUEST TO SUBSTITUTE. ALL LANDSCAPE MATERIAL AND WORKMANSHIP MUST MEET OR EXCEED BC LANDSCAPE STANDARD'S DEFINITION OF CONDITIONS OF AVAILABILITY. ALL PLANT MATERIAL MUST BE PROVIDED FROM CERTIFIED DISEASE FREE NURSERY.