

**MINUTES**  
**OPEN DESIGN ADVISORY PANEL MEETING**  
**SERVICE AND RESOURCE CENTRE BOARDROOM, 411 DUNSMUIR STREET, NANAIMO, BC**  
**THURSDAY, 2018-APR-12 AT 5:00 P.M.**

---

PRESENT:   Members:   Gur Minhas, Chair  
                              Councillor Hong  
                              Frank Basciano  
                              Martin Hagarty  
                              Charles Kierulf  
                              Kevin Krastel  
                              Will Melville

Absent:       Dan Appell

Staff:         Gary Noble, RPP, Development Approval Planner  
                  Tamera Rogers, Planner (Recording Secretary)

1.    CALL THE DESIGN ADVISORY PANEL MEETING TO ORDER:

The Open Design Advisory Panel Meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m.

2.    ADOPTION OF AGENDA:

It was moved and seconded that the Agenda, be adopted. The motion carried unanimously.

3.    ADOPTION OF MINUTES:

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Design Advisory Panel held in the Boardroom, 411 Dunsmuir Street, Nanaimo, BC, on Thursday 2018-FEB-08 at 5:00 p.m. be adopted as circulated. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Design Advisory Panel held in the Boardroom, 411 Dunsmuir Street, Nanaimo, BC, on Thursday 2018-MAR-08 at 5:00 p.m. be adopted as circulated. The motion carried unanimously.

4.    PRESENTATIONS:

(a)   Development Permit Application No. DP1093 - 4775 Uplands Drive

Gary Noble, Development Approval Planner introduced the project. The building form is broken into two masses due to storm water requirements. There is a Covenant on the property that requires underground parking. Staff considers the project to meet all General Development Permit Area Design Guidelines.

Brent Murdoch, Architect of Murdoch & Company Architecture + Planning Ltd., presented the project and spoke regarding the following:

- Site is a park-like setting with mature plantings.
- There is a large amount of negative space around existing buildings. The project tries to reflect this character through the introduction of courtyard spaces.
- Established a modest, traditional architectural style sensitive to the existing Longwood character with pitched roofs and darker colours compared to existing buildings, to create more presence.
- Two buildings have similar footprint and design.
- Potential for two different phases of development.
- Underground parking.
- Clientele appreciate conveniences such as easy vehicle drop-off space
- Substantial landscaping and infill has dual purpose: to maintain appearance of park-like setting and manage storm water.
- Specimen trees introduced (5m trees) to quickly establish a strong presence at corners and boundaries of property.
- Courtyard trees and plantings are smaller scale.
- Materials described: stone base, painted wood, hardi-product, etc.

Panel discussion took place regarding:

- Support for building siting and form and character as it is consistent with the character of the existing Longwood buildings.
- Height variance.
- Location of parking in front.
- Walkway width and connection to laneway.
- Possible addition of more indigenous plant species.
- Pond areas to have water year round.
- Electric car charging stations discussed and will be introduced.
- Trail lighting connecting to parking lot (south). It was suggested that more lighting be considered as this is a very convenient path.
- Site grades and the materials used for Building B.
- Discussed site grading and concerns about impact of retaining wall. Stacked rock retaining wall 2-3m high.
- Purpose of chimneys discussed--used to gather venting.
- Entrance feature thought to be out of scale with the rest of the building.

It was moved and seconded that Development Permit DP1093 be accepted as presented with support for the proposed building height and parking variances. The following recommendations were provided:

- Consider opportunities for adding outdoor amenity structure;
- Consider widening walkway connection to the building at the laneway pedestrian connection;
- Consider introducing more indigenous plant species to the plant palette;
- Consider adding an electric car charging station in the parkade;
- Consider introducing additional lighting to the path connecting to the Origin site.
- Consider adding a stone finish to Building B exposed concrete wall face on parkade; and,
- Consider enhancing the scale of the entry features to Buildings A and B.

The motion carried unanimously.

(b) Development Permit Application No. DP1055 - 531 Kennedy Street

Tamera Rogers, Planner introduced the project and spoke regarding the following:

- The concept has been revised from the version originally presented in 2017-JUL-27.
- 8 units, using existing house that will be raised and relocated on property.
- Landscape buffer variance requested for side yard buffer to accommodate parking.

Joyce Troost, Architect of Joyce Reid Troost Architecture presented the project and spoke regarding the following:

- New approach to use existing building, moving house to make it conforming.
- Raising building to allow for natural light and full height basement.
- Keeping the existing character of the building, updating the outside finishes.
- No longer asking for any variances other than Minimum Landscape Treatment Level 2d for both side yards to accommodate the parking area.
- Small units, with individual accesses and individual outdoor amenity space.
- Covered (not secure) bike storage in rear accessory building. Short term bike storage located in front.
- Surface parking accessed via lane.
- Screening will be provided between porches and patios for privacy.

Fred Brooks, Landscape Architect of Fred Brooks Landscape Architecture presented the Landscape Plan and spoke regarding the following:

- Landscape concept is intended to fit into the traditional character of the neighbourhood, but will also revitalize this older area.
- Elements, such as picket fence, reflect existing elements in neighbourhood.
- Discussed reasons for differing side yard fence heights - south needs more buffer, north needs less buffer between yards.
- Re-use of existing hedge in rear as buffer.
- Decorative downward lit LED fixture illuminates parking area. Low level bollard lighting as site lighting.

Panel discussion took place regarding:

- How much higher the house will be in relation to the street? The architect explained that it will appear essentially the same, only one foot higher.
- Not reusing attic space, elected to keep it the same.
- Garbage and bicycle storage combined. Can these be separated? And setback from the one unit.
- Bottom unit window size.
- Staff comments regarding porch column posts.
- Concerns raised about visibility due to the hedge adjacent to the lane.
- Size of front entry stairs.

- Maneuverability within the parking lot - may have some challenges reversing out of some stalls and could hit landscaping.
- Pedestrian entrance from Kennedy Street.
- Outdoor bike storage security.
- Concerns raised regarding overlook into yard from neighbouring properties and privacy of lower units.
- Pickets should be wood not aluminum, ensure spacing is appropriate.
- White wooden stairs and maintenance of same.

It was moved and seconded that Development Permit DP1055 be accepted as presented with support for the proposed Minimum Landscape Treatment Level variance. The following recommendations were provided:

- Consider relocating the accessory building to improve access to rear units and bicycle storage (with possible use of under stair space for bicycle storage);
- Consider increasing the window size on the west elevation for bottom units;
- Consider adding detail to the gable end on the front façade;
- Consider parking lot maneuverability by adding a hammerhead at the north end of the parking area;
- Consider ways to protect side yard landscaping adjacent to the parking area;
- Consider adding a gate at the Kennedy Street pedestrian entrance;
- Consider changing all fences to solid panels;
- Consider integrating the door and adjacent window together for the four lower units, with matching height and trim;
- Consider adding landscaping along lane dedication area;
- Consider making all railings wood railings; and,
- Consider adding low level lighting along the side yards.

The motion carried unanimously.

(c) Development Permit Application No. DP1096 - 1217 Manzanita Place

Gary Noble, Development Approval Planner introduced the project and spoke regarding a proposed building height which staff supports. It allows for smaller footprints.

Will Melville, Designer of Delinea Design Consultants Ltd., presented the project and spoke regarding the following:

- Site topography poses challenge, steep, rocky site.
- A road is located up the middle of site with units on either side
- Attempted to keep footprint as small as possible, allowing flexibility in unit siting with topography.
- 3 storey units with parking on first level.
- Units on lower side are two storey to preserve views.
- Internal road follows contours with 9-10% slope. Driveways are level.
- Three unit types, contemporary design with low slope, shed roofs.
- Decks project over driveway with garages tucked underneath
- Heavy timber used to emphasize entries.
- Direction of roof slope alternated to create undulation to reflect the rocky slope.
- To be clad with wood rather than vinyl siding.

Victoria Drakeford, Landscape Architect, of Victoria Drakeford Landscape Architect presented the Landscape Plan:

- Rock structures are main inspiration and focus as trees cannot be retained.
- Three major areas: bluffs, internal road, and storm water management through site.
- Try not to impact bluffs and reintroduce pine, fir and arbutus trees to revegetate the site.
- Will not be planting in view corridor adjacent to two-storey units.
- More decorative, ornamental grass and perennials in internal road area.
- Native plant palette used.
- Swales in between units designed as decorative rock gardens.
- Split-rail fence along park boundary.
- Green roofs over garages, units above will have views of these. Can be used as patios and for storm water retention.

Panel discussion took place regarding:

- Roof direction. It was suggested to alternate the roof direction to reflect the complexity of rocky site.
- Use of materials and differentiating units from each other.
- Unit 5 is near crown of slope - elevation of garage.
- Exterior patios regarding accessibility: gravel vs. hard surface.
- Confirmed that garbage pickup will be private collection.
- Fencing as a requirement of bylaw to separate between parks. Comment that split rail doesn't seem to fit with contemporary style of the units. Better not to have it.
- Internal driveway--will be broken up with different colour concrete and texture.

It was moved and seconded that Development Permit DP1096 be accepted as presented with support for the proposed building height; and, front and rear yard setback variances.

The motion carried unanimously.

5. ADJOURNMENT:

It was moved and seconded at 7:23 p.m. that the meeting terminate. The motion carried unanimously.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIR

CERTIFIED CORRECT:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CORPORATE OFFICER